STUDIES IN THE BUDDHIST TRADITIONS

BODHISATTVAS OF THE FOREST AND THE FORMATION OF THE MAHĀYĀNA

A Study and Translation of the Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā-sūtra



DANIEL BOUCHER

BODHISATTVAS OF THE FOREST
AND THE
FORMATION OF THE MAHĀYĀNA

Studies in the Buddhist Traditions

A publication of the
Institute for the Study of Buddhist Traditions
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Series Editor
Luis O. Gómez
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Editorial Board
Carl Bielefeldt
Stanford University, Palo Alto

Donald S. Lopez
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Gregory Schopen
University of California, Los Angeles

Daniel Stevenson
University of Kansas, Lawrence

STUDIES IN THE BUDDHIST TRADITIONS

Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna

A Study and Translation of the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā-sūtra*

Daniel Boucher

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAIʻI PRESS, HONOLULU

© 2008 Institute for the Study of Buddhist Traditions
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America
13 12 11 10 09 08 6 5 4 3 2 1

The Institute for the Study of Buddhist Traditions is part of the Department of Asian Languages and Cultures at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. It was founded in 1988 to foster research and publication in the study of Buddhism and of the cultures and literatures that represent it. In association with the University of Hawai'i Press, the Institute publishes the series Studies in the Buddhist Traditions, which is devoted to the publication of materials, translations, and monographs relevant to the study of Buddhist traditions, in particular as they radiate from the South Asian homeland. The series also publishes studies and conference volumes resulting from work carried out in affiliation with the Institute in Ann Arbor.

Publication of this book was assisted by a grant from the Hull Memorial Publication Fund of Cornell University.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Boucher, Daniel.
Bodhisattvas of the forest and the formation of the Mahayana : a study and translation of the Rastrapalapariprccha-sutra / Daniel Boucher.
p. cm.—(Studies in the Buddhist traditions)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-0-8248-2881-3 (hard cover : alk. paper)
1. Tripitaka. Sutrapitaka. Rastrapalapariprccha—Criticism, interpretation, etc.
2. Mahayana Buddhism—India—History. I. Tripitaka. Sutrapitaka.
Rastrapalapariprccha. English. II. Title.
BQ1777.B68 2008
294.3'85—dc22 2008007942

University of Hawai'i Press books are printed on acid-free paper and meet the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Council on Library Resources.

Designed by University of Hawai'i Press production staff
Printed by The Maple-Vail Book Manufacturing Group

Contents

Acknowledgments

My debt to friends and colleagues who have contributed so much to making this a better book is immense, and my gratitude to them all is impossible to express fully. Let me begin, however, with some appropriate institutional thanks. First, to Cornell University, where this book was written in its entirety, for providing a wonderful teaching and research environment. I am grateful to my colleagues in the Department of Asian Studies, particularly Ding Xiang Warner and Jane-Marie Law, for the many conversations, dinners, and tumblers of single-malt scotch that accompanied this work (Ding Xiang Warner deserves most of the credit for the scotch and is no slouch of a cook to boot). I would also like to thank the Hull Memorial Publication Fund at Cornell for providing a generous subvention toward this publication. The American Council of Learned Societies provided much needed fellowship support that enabled me to devote a full year to this project at a crucial time in my research. The Cambridge University Library gave me access to the manuscript that served as the basis of my translation of the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā-sūtra* as well as to microfilm of the manuscript. I am particularly grateful to Craig Jamieson for facilitating this access.

Special thanks are due also to Luis Gómez, who took this monograph on in the University of Hawai‘i series Studies in the Buddhist Traditions. His many efforts on my behalf will be forever appreciated. Pat Crosby at the University of Hawai‘i Press has seen this project through its final stages, and she has done so with immense patience. The high regard with which so many of my colleagues in Asian Studies hold her is entirely justified.

I have been the very lucky recipient of the generosity of quite a number of friends and colleagues who have shared their reflections, insights, and observations with me at various stages of the project. Early on Paul Harrison alerted me to a number of infelicities in my translation, saving me from more than a few embarrassments. I am ever grateful for his keen eyes. Stephen Bokenkamp, Seishi Karashima, Tansen Sen, and Valerie Hansen all contributed in various ways from the sinological side (and Seishi especially at the end with his own ambitious projects weighing upon him). On the South Asian side, I owe a great debt to John Strong, who agreed to read the entire manuscript late in the game,

for sharing with me his many insights. The same goes for Richard Salomon, who has twice shared his observations with me, well above and beyond the call of duty, and to Kevin Trainor, whose comments on the manuscript came in the midst of burdensome professional responsibilities. Far afield from Asian studies, my good friend Chris Warner applied his sharp eye to the project and called my attention to things only an outsider would catch.

A very special thanks is due to Jan Nattier, who has read parts of this project at various stages of completion, sometimes more than once, and who took the trouble to give the final draft yet another careful review. I have benefited greatly from the years of conversation with Jan on many matters of mutual interest. I am indeed fortunate to have been the frequent beneficiary of her seemingly endless generosity.

As I was in the final stages of editing this book, I learned of the untimely death of Antonino Forte, who was once again serving as director of the Italian School of East Asian Studies in Kyoto, Japan. Nino was not involved directly with this project, but he contributed much toward making my yearlong stay in Kyoto productive some years ago. It was then that I first turned to my study of Dharmarakṣa's translation of the *Rāṣṭrapāla.* I benefited greatly from his warmth, generosity, and sound advice. I will miss him deeply.

I am also grateful to the many students at Cornell who have engaged my oral renditions of Mahāyāna history played out in this book. In particular, to my graduate student Shi Chikai, who endured a reading course on Dharmarakṣa's third-century Chinese translation with good cheer, and to John Johnson, for being a superb conversation partner in our readings in the sociology of religion. He was a wonderful sounding board for a number of the ideas that found a place in Chapter 4.

Thanks are due also to Michael Willis of the British Museum for helping out with the jacket cover art at the last moment and to Susan Stone, who did a superb job with the copy editing, improving the manuscript greatly.

Lastly, but certainly not least, to my partner Les Morrison, who did absolutely nothing to make this a better book besides staying out of my way while I worked. However, he did a lot to make my life during this project very much better, and for that I will always be grateful.

Abbreviations

AN	*Aṅguttara-nikāya* (all references to Pāli texts are to Pali Text Society editions)
BHS[D/G]	Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary/Grammar (Edgerton 1953a)
Chin.	Chinese
CPD	*Critical Pāli Dictionary* (Trenckner et al. 1924–)
CSZJJ	*Chu sanzang ji ji* 出三藏記集 (T 2145)
DĀ	*Dīrghāgama* (T 1)
Dh	Dharmarakṣa and/or his translation of *RP: Deguang taizi jing* 德光太子經 (T 170)
DN	*Dīgha-nikāya*
Dp	Dānapāla and/or his translation of *RP: Huguo zunzhe suowen dasheng jing* 護國尊者所問大乘經 (T 321)
DPPN	*Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names* (Malalasekera [1937] 1974)
Gdh.	Gāndhārī
GSZ	*Gaoseng zhuan* 高僧傳 (T 2059)
j.	*juan* 卷 (fascicle)
Jg	Jñānagupta and/or his translation of *RP: Huguo pusa hui* 護國菩薩會 (T 310.18)
KN	Kern and Nanjio 1908–1912
KP	*Kāśyapa-parivarta* (cited by section nos. in von Stäel-Holstein 1926)
LV	*Lalitavistara* (Hokazono 1994)
MĀ	*Madhyamāgama* (T 26)
Mahāvyutpatti	Sakaki 1916
m.c.	*metri causa*
MIA	Middle Indo-Āryan
MN	*Majjhima-nikāya*
MPS	*Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* (Waldschmidt 1950/1951)
MS	Nepalese manuscript that served as the basis of Finot's edition: Cambridge University, Add. 1586. My readings of the original are noted where necessary.
Mv	*Mahāvastu* (Senart 1882–1897)

RP	*Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā-sūtra* (Finot 1901)
RR	*Ratnarāśi-sūtra* (cited by section nos. in Silk 1994)
Śikṣ	*Śikṣāsamuccaya* (Bendall 1897–1902)
Skt.	Sanskrit text of *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā* as published in Finot 1901. Page numbers of Finot's edition are indicated in square brackets throughout the translation.
SN	*Saṃyutta-nikāya*
SWTF	*Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden.* (Waldschmidt et al. 1973–)
T	*Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* (Takakusu and Watanabe 1924–1935); texts are referred to by serial number followed by volume, page, register, and, where appropriate, line numbers
Tib.	Tibetan translation of *RP: ʻphags pa yul ʻkhor skyoṅ gis źus pa źes bya ba theg pa chen poʼi mdo* as edited in Ensink 1952, 60–125, with readings from *Them spaṅs ma* redactions not included in Ensink's edition (see Introduction)
UP	*Ugraparipṛcchā-sūtra*
v., vv.	verse, verses

Introduction

Thinking about the Mahāyāna

The study of the collection of Buddhist movements known as the Great Vehicle is in need of some methodological direction. It seems to me there have been enough general theories of its origins. Some, particularly Japanese, scholars have seen a lay-centered development in the texts, a pseudo-Reformation against monastic elitism. Others see it as riding the wave of bhakti devotionalism sweeping across India at the turn of the Common Era—as if Hindus and Buddhists alike suddenly discovered that the gods were open for business. Still others have emphasized the philosophical innovations of the Mahāyāna and its seeming tendency to carry certain early doctrines to their logical conclusion. These theories—and many more—have been spun now by multiple generations of scholars.

When we begin to catalogue the things we don't know concerning the origins of the Mahāyāna, the list quickly becomes daunting. Unlike scholars of, say, early Christianity, we have little idea as to which social classes were drawn to this movement. We don't know, for example, what really to make of the prominent presence of the figure of the *gṛhapati*—usually translated as householder, but almost certainly a man of considerable means, perhaps a guild master—in early Mahāyāna *sūtra*s such as the *Ugraparipṛcchā*. Does the presence of such an interlocutor indicate that the Mahāyāna had a strong initial appeal to wealthy members of Indian society, or was their narrative role more a form of advertising, an attempt to draw such individuals toward a movement desperately in want of patronage?

We do, however, have some sense that a number of individuals who aligned themselves with the various Mahāyānas throughout much of its early and middle history perceived themselves as reviled by their Mainstream monastic brethren.[1] But we often have little sense of how Mainstream monks themselves regarded their co-religionists on the bodhisattva path or if they regarded them at all. Moreover, did non-Buddhists take note of such divisions, or were these multiple spiritual orientations invisible to outsiders, in much the same way ancient Romans regarded first-century Christianity as a "Jewish disturbance"? Indeed, when we come to grips with the range of questions our classicist colleagues can ask and often answer with regard to the birth of Christianity and its domestication within the Roman empire, it is easy to become mildly demoralized at our situation as historians of the Mahāyāna. Only recently have we

begun to catch glimpses of hope that a way out of this morass may be at hand. This project is an attempt to pick up some of the current momentum in early Mahāyāna studies and to identify a set of threads that manifest themselves as an interdependent skein of influences upon a single text within this literature.

Much of the recent scholarship on the early Mahāyāna points to a tradition that arose not as a single, well-defined, unitary movement, but from multiple trajectories emanating from and alongside Mainstream Buddhism.[2] Whether we focus upon developments of ascetic rigor, the apotheosis of the Buddha or buddhas, or the virtues of *dāna* (gifting, generosity), in almost every instance we see continuity from early Buddhism to multiple Mahāyāna developments.

In fact, there is good reason to believe that the spiritual orientation of monastics was in some sense independent of their institutional affiliations. So, for example, membership in a Dharmaguptaka monastery may in itself say nothing about any given individual's beliefs or practices apart from conforming to certain disciplinary regulations. It may have been relatively easy in some cases for a small group of monks to congregate around a common text or ritual agenda apart from their co-religionists. Mainstream monks in some monasteries may well have reacted with indifference to the bodhisattva aspirations of some of their brethren, whereas others—as evidenced by the scathing critiques recorded by some Mahāyāna authors (including those of the *Rāṣṭrapāla*)—would have been far less sympathetic. Different communities responded to different concerns, not the least of which may have included their own sense of the perceptions and expectations of their most loyal donors.[3] Texts and inscriptions both make clear that patronage was never far from the minds of monks of all periods.

Perhaps our most pressing desideratum, therefore, is to conceive an appropriate model with which to think about the complex of traditions we have come to lump under the label "Mahāyāna." Here a comparison with other new religious movements may be helpful, especially in fields more thoroughly worked or in possession of richer sources. I think in this regard particularly of Mormonism, an analogy I owe to my colleague Jan Nattier. Here we have a tradition whose formation is relatively recent and therefore well documented. It presented itself as a new revelation that did not replace but completed the existing scriptures. Like the bodhisattva career, the spiritual path of the Latter-day Saints is conceived of as a multilife process aimed at the eventual apotheosis of all male members. And, as with the Mahāyāna, the Latter-day Saints have had a complicated relationship with the mainstream.

For example, much of the early appeal of converts to Joseph Smith's new movement was "to its allure as a form of primitive Christianity."[4] Early Mahāyāna texts too often implicitly characterized themselves as a restoration of the Buddha's original message, which a corrupt *saṅgha* had long since lost. One of the

problems, however, with the scholarship on the early Mahāyāna is that it typically treats this movement as an established fact. But if the authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* are to be believed, it would appear that their Mainstream contemporaries did not.[5] That is to say, much ink was spilled in defending the status of early Mahāyāna *sūtra*s as *buddhavacana* (the word of the Buddha). Some accepted them, some did not. The interesting question for us then is this: why would someone accept an (obviously?) new *sūtra* as the word of the Buddha? Just as the early Mormons preached largely from the King James Bible in winning new converts,[6] the authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* strategically borrowed from the idiom of pre-Mahāyāna sources, including some of the earliest texts in the Buddhist canon.[7] It is not unlikely that this was intended to impart an archaic aura to the text that would have disguised their role in its production.[8]

Joseph Smith and his first disciples are known to have been desperately impoverished. Those drawn to him and his new revelation often shared a deep resentment against the well-to-do and, particularly, against the unresponsiveness of the religious establishment. Smith's message explicitly addressed these dissatisfactions.[9] Consider the following passage from the *Book of Mormon*:

> Because of pride, and because of false teachers, and false doctrines, their churches have become corrupted, and their churches are lifted up; because of pride they are puffed up.
>
> They rob the poor because of their fine sanctuaries; they rob the poor because of their fine clothing; and they persecute the meek and the poor in heart, because in their pride they are puffed up.[10]

These verses would fit squarely in the *Rāṣṭrapāla* with only cosmetic adjustments. We might wonder then if the authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* also suffered from economic impoverishment. We know that they assumed that some of their fellow monks left the household merely to escape poverty: "They will receive rebirth in poor families on account of their undisciplined practice. Becoming renunciants from these poor families, they will take satisfaction in the teaching at this time only for the sake of profit."[11] Were their complaints about their brethren's preoccupation with profit and honor a barely masked envy? Were those drawn to this bodhisattva network likewise disenfranchised? If so, we would expect that the leaders of this group would have to have offered an alternative commodity to attract those deprived of the rewards enjoyed by their more affluent co-religionists. I will attempt to show that the *Rāṣṭrapāla* provides evidence of just such a promise.

To make one final comparison: the capacity for individual revelation, encouraged in the early days following Joseph Smith's divinely appointed mission,

proved to be divisive. If every male member of the church can and should receive his orders directly from God, why would such an individual submit to commands mediated by church officials? Despite his later attempts to rein in his flock and restrict prophecy, Joseph Smith had let the genie out of the bottle.[12] In so doing, he precipitated the eventual emergence of over two hundred Mormon splinter groups, many of which acted with an authority that in every way paralleled the one claimed by Smith himself.[13] Might not the proliferation of Mahāyāna *sūtras* be a similar phenomenon? Individual monks came to see themselves as empowered to speak for or, more literally, to speak *as* the Buddha. Whether they did so on the authority of an ecstatic experience that brought them into direct association with a living buddha or by means of other secret transmissions, each new Mahāyāna *sūtra* embodied in some sense a new vision and a new movement.[14] Once the floodgate was opened, the production of a massive literature containing new "revelations" was sure to follow.

These are the kinds of questions that inform this study. Accordingly, I am first and foremost interested in the Mahāyāna as a social phenomenon rather than as a philosophical school. To this end, we need to think like scholars of the Latter-day Saints, not scholars of the Yogācāra—of Hare Krishnas, not Nāgārjuna. Thus my analysis will attempt to address what Weber has called the "economic ethic" of religion. Rather than being interested primarily in the "ethical theories of theological compendia," I will focus on "the practical impulses for action which are founded in the psychological and pragmatic contexts of religions."[15] I will want to know, for example, about the processes of group formation and self identity: what accounts for the predisposition of some monks to accept the bodhisattva path—along with its doctrinal innovations, cosmology, and cults—as opposed to other forms of protest? How did members congregate and maintain relationships with both insiders and outsiders? Could a monk participate in a bodhisattva network in plain view of his monastery's elders? And when the monastery's elders did not approve, what was the source of their opposition? Our texts seldom speak directly to these questions. But as in all academic enterprises, the hard part is getting the questions right in the first place.

The *Rāṣṭrapāla,* however, will not be reduced to a mere expression of its social situation. Functionalist approaches have been rightly criticized for their tendency toward chronological compartmentalization and circular reasoning and for their inattentiveness to the content of religious discourse. Certainly Buddhist studies has historically concerned itself—almost exclusively in many cases—with doctrine and polemics. Scholars of Buddhism have until quite recently been less sensitive to the social dynamics that precede ideology. This study seeks to address this imbalance, to show that the rhetoric of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* itself calls for an analysis that lays bare its disguised forms of exchange.

Situating the "Early" Mahāyāna

I am not, for the sake of this study, going to preoccupy myself with what we might—or should—mean by "early" with regard to the Mahāyāna. Scholars have long talked about the early Mahāyāna as if we all knew what we meant. Clearly, we don't. As historians, we naturally want to know where the witnesses to this movement can be placed on a timeline. We understand that this cannot be done in absolute terms. The Indian materials are almost universally silent on such matters—in part by the necessity of legitimating such texts as the word of the Buddha—and the Chinese translations can usually only provide a *terminus ante quem*. The best we can hope for, it seems, is a relative chronology of texts.

But there are more than a few problems with even a relative chronology. First of all, there are a bewildering array of criteria for dating texts in relation to one another. Traits one scholar takes as a marker of antiquity are to another signs of advanced development. This problem may not be intractable. But it is certainly indicative of the current state of Mahāyāna textual studies, despite some general agreement about the probable earliness or lateness of particular candidates.[16]

Our preoccupation with dating, however, masks a number of features about these texts that constitute much more interesting, and therefore fruitful, avenues of investigation. We might want, for instance, to discern the social milieu of any given text as intimated by its rhetorical strategy. To whom is the author speaking? Whom is he ignoring? Under what conditions might this text have appealed to the target audience? These questions require a greater sensitivity to matters of tone and voice than we have generally paid, and they are not necessarily restricted to any one time period. In fact, evidence from the *Rāṣṭrapāla* will point to the likelihood that it was made to respond over time to multiple milieux.

Second, and this may be the more important point, this concern with dating may very well place the proverbial cart before the proverbial horse. Given the paucity of well-studied *sūtra*s at our disposal, it might seem presumptuous to classify that which we do not yet well understand. Thus my use of the term "early" will mean little more here than pre-Gupta, texts that we have good reason to believe were composed (at least in part) before the fourth century and therefore prior to the beginnings of the institutional presence of the Mahāyāna within the Indian religious landscape. This is profoundly inadequate, but given the current state of the field, it will have to do.

Perhaps the most insightful observations on this problem have been proffered recently by Paul Harrison, who has reminded us that all of the earliest developments of this movement must have taken place before our earliest extant sources.[17] That is to say, our earliest documents of this movement, consisting of at least the Mahāyāna *sūtra*s translated into Chinese during the second and

third centuries, reflect an already fully elaborated set of traditions that must have undergone a long period of development. Thus, in the study of the early Mahāyāna, we are in the awkward position of never knowing with any certainty how long it would have taken any particular idea, doctrine, literary motif, or practice to find textual expression in India and, subsequently, translation in China.[18] Given the complexity with which the Mahāyāna does finally appear within the textual record in second-century Chinese translations, we can only assume that these texts must have been preceded by long, involved debates within this fledgling movement and that these debates would have varied according to the different responses of their co-religionists.

Why the *Rāṣṭrapāla*?

Relatively little early Mahāyāna literature is preserved in Indian languages, and much of what is extant is in late (sixteenth to twentieth century) Nepalese manuscripts. Thus any adequate attempt to appreciate the breadth of this movement will have to work to a large degree with translations, particularly the large corpora preserved in Chinese and Tibetan.

Among the advantages of the Chinese translations is the fact that the earliest among them date from a period centuries—in some cases, many centuries—before our Indic source materials. Already in the late second century we see the translation of a small but significant body of Mahāyāna literature, particularly by the Yuezhi missionary Lokakṣema and his team at the Eastern Han capital of Luoyang. By the end of the third century, the translations number in the hundreds.

At the heart of my initial entrée into this literature during my graduate student days was a seemingly simple query: how reliable are these early Chinese translations for the study of Indian Buddhism? I say "seemingly simple" because as I dove headfirst into this translation literature, I discovered that questions of fidelity merely scratched the surface of the problem. Years later I now find myself traveling, figuratively, back and forth over the Himalayas to reconsider this question anew.

It was clear from the outset that, in order to do justice to a study of early Chinese translation literature, I would have to acquire a level of comfort in its archaic, often obscure idiom. To do so would require that I isolate a particular translator so as to understand his habits, his syntax, his lexicon, and, where possible, something of his overall strategy. Paul Harrison blazed a trail in this regard with his work on the corpus of Lokakṣema. If I was to answer some of the questions I wanted to pose, I would need a corpus of translations for which at least a fair number had extant Sanskrit "originals." This led me to the Yuezhi translator Dharmarakṣa, whose corpus included over 150 texts, roughly half of which are extant, with Sanskrit

witnesses for several. Deciphering his idiom and the problems he confronted in translation became the focus of my dissertation research.

Having settled upon a translator, I next wanted to choose a text with an extant Sanskrit version for comparison. I wanted to know how Dharmarakṣa's translation differed from the Indic text and whether his rendition would expose some of the early textual history of the Sanskrit *sūtra* that has come down to us only in late manuscripts. I also wanted a text with multiple Chinese translations so that I could chart these changes, if any, over time. Finally, I thought it prudent to choose a translation within Dharmarakṣa's corpus of modest size, a project that would allow me time not only to read and translate the *sūtra*, but to unpack the significance of the findings from both the Indian and the Chinese sources. With these criteria in mind, I chose the *Rāṣṭrapāla* as my first integral textual study from Dharmarakṣa's works. Besides Dharmarakṣa's translation of 270 C.E., we have Jñānagupta's translation of the late sixth century and Dānapāla's of the late tenth. We also have a Tibetan translation from the early ninth century. Our earliest Sanskrit manuscript for the text dates to the late seventeenth century.

But apart from my interests in the early Chinese Buddhist translations, it turns out the timing of this study of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* could hardly have been better. Over the last two decades, a number of scholars have opened new avenues for our understanding of the manifold voices represented in the early Mahāyāna. One of the loudest among this chorus—and in the case of the *Rāṣṭrapāla*, certainly the most shrill—is the wilderness-dwelling faction. Thanks to Reginald Ray's recent study on the subterranean forest traditions that percolated up from the recesses of the mainstream from time to time, we are better able to see what was almost certainly a formative strand of the early Mahāyāna. These bodhisattva critics were not always well received by their monastic brethren, since their charges constituted a potential threat to their status in the eyes of lay donors. And we have the recent work of Gregory Schopen to thank for making this socioeconomic context of the classical Indian monastery so vividly real for us.

Source Materials for the Study of the *Rāṣṭrapāla*

The extant materials for research on the *Rāṣṭrapāla* are manifold. A Nepalese Sanskrit manuscript, dated to 1661 and held at Cambridge University, was edited by Louis Finot over a century ago.[19] Another manuscript held in Paris was known to Finot but not used, since he understood it to be a copy of the Cambridge manuscript. A manuscript preserved in Tokyo was studied by Itō and partially examined by de Jong, who found nothing in the way of textual variation vis-à-vis the Cambridge manuscript.[20] More recently, at least four copies of the Sanskrit text have come to light from the German-Nepali Preservation Proj-

ect, but they are all very late (eighteenth to twentieth century) and derivative. In addition, we have five citations of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* in Śāntideva's eighth-century anthology, the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, some of which are quite sizable.

The early-ninth-century Tibetan translation by Jinamitra, Dānaśīla, Munivarma, and Ye śes sde was edited over fifty years ago by Jacob Ensink as an appendix to his English translation of the Sanskrit: *'phags pa yul 'khor skyoṅ gis źus pa źes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*.[21] Unfortunately, his edition could hardly be called critical by the standards of today's Kanjur studies.[22] All four of his textual representatives derive from the *Tshal pa* or Eastern recension branch, and one of his witnesses, the Lhasa Kanjur, is widely recognized now to be a mere copy of another *Tshal pa* text and thus has no independent text critical value. In addition, the readings of the Derge (*sde dge*) version are known to have been contaminated by the *Them spaṅs ma,* or Western line, thus reducing its text critical value (though not the quality of its readings). For this reason I have felt it necessary to augment Ensink's edition of the Narthang and Peking recensions by consulting at least two of the *Them spaṅs ma* representatives: the Stog Palace manuscript and the London (*Śel dkar*) manuscript *bka' 'gyur*.[23]

We also have at our disposal three Chinese translations. The earliest translation by the third-century Yuezhi monk Dharmarakṣa, the *Deguang taizi jing* 德光太子經 (T 170, 4: 412a–418c), has not been recognized as a translation of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* by Western scholars, including Ensink. In Japan, the *Deguang taizi jing* was acknowledged as a translation of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* at least since Itō's early studies.[24] De Jong also drew our attention to the importance of this early translation in his 1953 review of Ensink independently of Itō, whose work he had not seen.[25] The date for the completion of the translation is recorded as the sixth year of the Taishi reign period, on the thirtieth day of the ninth month (= October 31, 270).[26] Chapters 5 and 6 will be largely focused on the problems presented to us by Dharmarakṣa's translation.[27]

The *sūtra* was retranslated in the late sixth century by Jñānagupta, a monk from Gandhāra, and Dharmagupta, who appears to have served as scribal assistant, at the Da Xingshan monastery.[28] Their translation occurs within the *Mahāratnakūṭa* anthology in the *Taishō* canon: *Huguo pusa hui* 護國菩薩會 (T 310.18, 11: 457b–472b).[29] This translation is of great importance. With Jñānagupta's rendering we see what is essentially the final form of the text. That is to say, Jñānagupta's text largely coincides in structure and content with the later Chinese translation by Dānapāla, the Tibetan translation of the ninth century, and the Sanskrit manuscript tradition as it has come down to us from Nepal. There are small differences among these various witnesses to be sure. But it is clear that the full fleshing out of the Indic text as we have it occurred between the composition of the source texts for Dharmarakṣa's translation of 270 and

Jñānagupta's of the late sixth century. I will discuss the implications of this dating in Chapter 6.

The *Rāṣṭrapāla* was translated again in 994 by Dānapāla (Shihu 施護): *Huguo zunzhe suowen dasheng jing* 護國尊者所問大乘經 (T 321, 12: 1a–14c).[30] Dānapāla arrived at the Northern Song capital of Kaifeng in 980 and proved to be among the most productive of the Song translators, working up to his death in 1018.[31] This translation is of considerably less value than the preceding two. It offers little in the way of important textual variants, and where it does differ, it is usually in the form of translation mistakes and interpolations. Often Dānapāla's rendering bears little relationship to any of our other versions. This is what we have come to expect from Song period translations.[32] Accordingly, I have paid less attention to this text in my annotation to the translation. We have, in sum, a rather rich variety of witnesses to the shape of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* over some fourteen centuries.[33]

Dating and Locating the Indic Text

Ignorance of the existence of Dharmarakṣa's translation has dramatically affected attempts to date the Indic text. Winternitz, commenting on the Sanskrit edition in the early years of the twentieth century, had this to say: "The Chinese translation of the Rāṣṭrapāla-Paripṛcchā made between 585 and 592 A.D., proves that the conditions here described, already existed in the 6th century. The Sūtra is probably not much earlier than the Chinese translation as is shown by the barbaric language, which particularly in the Gāthās is a mixture of Prākrit and bad Sanskrit, and by the elaborate metres and the careless style."[34] As a result of Edgerton's magisterial work, we now know that Winternitz drew entirely unwarranted conclusions concerning the nature of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit. The very criterion by which he determined the language of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* to be late, namely, the "barbaric" mixture of Prakrit and Sanskrit, is now widely thought to be an indicator of an earlier, pre-Sanskritized phase of Mahāyāna literature.[35]

However, other scholars, also oblivious to the existence of an early Chinese translation, drew very different conclusions concerning its date on the basis of internal evidence. Consider, for example, the remarks of A. K. Warder:

> One of the other *sūtras* of the *Ratnakūṭa* collection available in Sanskrit, the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā*, deals somewhat more elaborately (though still unsystematically) with the way of the *bodhisattva*, referring for illustration to fifty *jātaka* stories. There is no external evidence for its great antiquity, but its content would harmonise with its being even earlier than the *Ratnakūṭa Sūtra*, before the open breach with the 'pupils' (who are not

> here denounced), in fact a *sūtra* of the Pūrva Śaila school not remodelled after the breach. The ethical principles do not differ from those of the more original *Tripiṭaka* except for the commendation of the way of the *bodhisattva* and, in connection with this way, the additional stress on self-sacrifice (in fulfilling the perfections).[36]

Warder raises a number of points here that deserve further comment. First and most obvious, the supposed lack of "external evidence for its great antiquity" we now know—and have known for some time—cannot be substantiated in recognition of Dharmarakṣa's third-century translation. The mere existence of Dharmarakṣa's rendering does not guarantee that the *Rāṣṭrapāla* is necessarily one of the earliest Mahāyāna *sūtra*s now extant. Warder's claim that it may be older than the *Ratnakūṭa-sūtra* (= *Kāśyapa-parivarta*) is striking, since we can date that text to at least the late second century on the basis of its translation by Lokakṣema. But we must be suspicious of this claim as well, as it is founded on the belief that the *Rāṣṭrapāla* represents a voice from before "the breach with the pupils." The implicit assumption here is that hostility between adherents of the Mahāyāna and the Mainstream must reflect a later development of the former, a time after a presumed idyllic cohabitation among monks of different orientations and a time before Mahāyānists thought to contrast themselves sharply with their Mainstream co-religionists.[37] As I have suggested above and will demonstrate at some length, the reality was far less tidy than this. Developments, hostile or otherwise, did not necessarily proceed apace in all regions or even in all monasteries with monks of multiple spiritual aspirations. Warder is right to point out, however, that the so-called ethical principles of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* do not deviate appreciably from the Mainstream. This will be discussed at length in Chapter 4.

Warder's association of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* with the Pūrva-śaila school of Andhra Pradesh is based on a reference to a text titled *Raṭṭhapāla-gajjita* in the fourteenth-century Sinhalese compendium the *Nikāya-saṃgraha*.[38] This reference does not inspire confidence. It is, first of all, very late and after a time when orthodox impositions had largely eliminated the Mahāyāna from Sri Lanka. Second, we cannot know with certainty that the text here alluded to is in fact our *Rāṣṭrapāla*. Andhra Pradesh in south central India has long been one of the sites associated by modern scholars with the rise of the Mahāyāna—the other being Gandhāra in the northwest.[39] These attempts to locate the rise of the movement geographically have taken their cues from vague references in a very few texts. It is, in my opinion, much more likely that the Mahāyāna quickly became a pan-Indian phenomenon and that any attempt to isolate its location is doomed in advance.

Why a New Translation?

Readers familiar with the scope of Mahāyāna *sūtra* literature may be puzzled by the retranslation of a text that has been available in English for over fifty years.[40] Indeed, with many hundreds of Mahāyāna *sūtra*s still untouched, it may appear imprudent to revisit seemingly known territory. There are several reasons, however, why a new translation of this text is appropriate. First, the published reviews of Ensink's translation have pointed out numerous problems with his understanding of the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions of the text.[41] To be fair, the language of the text is difficult in many places, and the Nepalese manuscript is rife with corruptions. Finot's Sanskrit edition, the basis for Ensink's and my translation, is itself fraught with numerous problems. Ensink was able to improve on it in a number of ways. Moreover, Ensink had the misfortune to publish his translation, which was his Ph.D. thesis, just one year before the appearance of Edgerton's *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. Many of his lexical uncertainties would have been solved by access to this work. We are thus far better placed today to understand the language of this text than in 1952.

Second, Ensink was not able to take advantage of the Chinese translations of the *Rāṣṭrapāla*, which, as I will demonstrate below, contain invaluable data on its textual history. In particular, Dharmarakṣa's translation allows us to track the development of an early version of the text from the mid-third century to the late sixth century, the time of Jñānagupta's translation and the time when the text essentially assumed its final form. These two translations are the only evidence we have about one of the crucial phases of the text's formation, a phase that largely coincides with the Indian Gupta period. This evidence will be discussed in Chapter 6.

Moreover, interest in and research on these early Chinese Buddhist translations have been steadily increasing during the last two decades. One thinks especially of Erik Zürcher's work on the vernacularisms sprinkled throughout the Han and Three Kingdoms translations, Florin Deleanu's and Stefano Zacchetti's recent studies on An Shigao, Paul Harrison's work on the corpus of Lokakṣema, and Seishi Karashima's impressive studies of Dharmarakṣa, particularly the latter's translation of the *Lotus Sūtra*. Jan Nattier has recently begun to compile a very promising lexicon on the translation idiom of the early-third-century lay translator Zhi Qian. All of this makes the task of confronting these recondite works slightly less daunting.

But perhaps the most important reason for revisiting the *Rāṣṭrapāla* at this time is its relevance to current discussions concerning the formation of the Mahāyāna. As I will argue at length below, the *Rāṣṭrapāla* is representative of a clear but as yet still underappreciated strand of the early bodhisattva orientation, namely, a reactionary critique of sedentary monasticism in favor of a re-

turn to wilderness dwelling. An adequate reappraisal of this critique requires that we make full use of the source materials at our disposal so as to best place this discourse in its historical context.

The Plan for This Study

This study has two fundamental aims: an analysis of the major themes of the Indian text and an examination of the value of Dharmarakṣa's translation. My goal in the first four chapters is to reflect on the relationship between the bodily glorification of the Buddha and the ascetic career—spanning thousands of lifetimes—that produced it within the socioreligious world of early medieval Buddhist monasticism. The context for the glorification of the Buddha's body within the *Rāṣṭrapāla* is essentially threefold: the placement of the Buddha's career within the genre of *jātaka* (former birth story) narratives from the Mainstream canonical and art historical traditions; the centrality of wilderness dwelling and the ascetic rigors of those who embraced it; and a criticism of sedentary monasticism, of monks fully entrenched in the socioeconomic affairs of the secular world and thereby perceived to be lax and corrupt. These three themes are interrelated. The authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* criticize their monastic contemporaries as no longer following the ascetic ideal of the first Buddhist communities, an ideal that, for some in the Mahāyāna, self-consciously imitates the disciplines and sacrifices of the Buddha's own bodhisattva career, the very career that led to his acquisition of bodily perfection. I will begin then by revealing the ways in which the authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* co-opted this topos concerning the bodily perfection of the Buddha from the Mainstream tradition to subvert their contemporaries who represented that tradition.

Part 2 will focus on Dharmarakṣa's third-century Chinese translation of the text. Part of my argument above depends on placing the textual development of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* in a more nuanced historical framework. Our only means of doing this is to chart the changes in the Chinese translations from the late third century to the late tenth century. In this regard Dharmarakṣa's translation has special significance since it differs considerably from all other witnesses.

However, the early Chinese translations are as invaluable as they are problematic. I will demonstrate that a critical use of these translations requires that we understand not only their abstruse idiom—no small matter in itself—but also the process by which these texts were rendered from an undetermined Indian language into a Chinese cultural product. This process left many traces, and these traces will reveal clues about the nature of the source text as well as the world of the principal recipients.

A Note on the Translation

It is now customary in scholarly translations to defuse a reader's anxiety in confronting a text in translation by assuring him or her that the translator has every intention of adhering closely to the original. The author does this by promising what is often called a literal translation, as if every word or phrase in the source text had a single, clear equivalent in the target language.

The reader will get no such crutch here. Not only am I convinced that another equally or better qualified reader of the Sanskrit *Rāṣṭrapāla* could produce a different, yet equally valid, translation of the text, I am also certain that if I were to translate the *Rāṣṭrapāla* ten more times, I would end up with ten different translations. A translation is first and foremost a reading of a text, and as a reading, it is influenced by what I've read before and during the translation process. I have no doubt that in the years to come I will see some things in the *Rāṣṭrapāla* differently.

So while this cannot be the final word on the *Rāṣṭrapāla*, the purpose of the textual analysis and annotation to the translation is to convince my readers that they have a reliable guide through the text. I won't hold your hand, but I will alert you to places that may be worth a second look. I expect that in the near future some of my readers will alert me to places where I could have lingered a little longer. In other words, I offer this contribution as part of an ongoing and much larger dialogue among students of Buddhism. It is nothing more than that—and, I hope, nothing less.

A final note: since part of the purpose of this study is to make a case for the value of the early Chinese translations for the study of Indian Buddhist textual history, it seemed to me appropriate to make the idiom and structure of Dharmarakṣa's rendition as transparent as possible. The notes to the translation are designed to illuminate variant and sometimes bizarre readings from the manifold versions at our disposal. For the reader less interested in such technicalities, I have marked in boldface those portions of my translation from the Sanskrit that are also represented in Dharmarakṣa's third-century translation. Thus readers can see immediately the basic shape of the earliest version available to us. Beyond the *Rāṣṭrapāla*, all other translations from Buddhist sources are my own unless otherwise stated.

PART I

Asceticism and the Glorification of the Buddha's Body

The Indian Text of the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā-sūtra*

CHAPTER ONE

The Physiognomy of Virtue

Behold the shining Buddha's body,
Adorned with its marks!
Who would not aspire to that awakening,
Brought to perfection by cognition?
—*Ajātaśatrukaukṛtyavinodanā-sūtra*[1]

Bodily Perfection in the Mainstream Tradition

For the ancients—and, I suspect, lingering just under the radar of our collective contemporary conscience—bodily perfection was only the most obvious sign of moral superiority, a plenitude in the soul "radiating youth, vigor, and beauty."[2] The formula "beauty is only skin deep" in our modern parlance attempts to undermine this physiognomy of virtue at the same time it betrays its hold. The classical Indian world also formulated an essential connection between bodily and moral attainment. Brahmanical writers, especially in *dharmaśāstra* literature, regularly saw bodily appearance as an indicator of character and virtue.[3]

All of our hagiographies are agreed that the Buddha's extraordinary status was both cognitive and somatic. The circumstances of his conception, gestation, and birth were miraculous, and the newly born Buddha-to-be was already marked by auspicious signs read by a local soothsayer.[4] These signs, traditionally listed as the thirty-two marks of a superhuman *(mahāpuruṣa-lakṣaṇa),* are said to endow both a buddha-to-be and a universal monarch, and they are known to our purportedly earliest texts.[5] Canonical sources such as the *Lakkhaṇa-sutta* attempt to explain how each of the marks is the karmic result of particular virtues practiced during former lives.[6] Thus we learn that by his being a dispeller of fear and a provider of protection and shelter, the soles of the Buddha's feet were marked by wheels with a thousand spokes; as a dispenser of the Dharma, he acquired ankles placed high on the calf; by his former religious inquiries, he acquired delicate skin

on which no dust could adhere; and so on with regard to his acquisition of golden-colored skin, retracted penis, rounded shoulders, and deep blue eyes.[7]

The thirty-two marks of the *mahāpuruṣa* received considerable scholarly attention quite early on. Already in 1852 Burnouf contributed a lengthy discussion as an appendix to his translation of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra,* in part to further demonstrate that such physical features on the Buddha attest to his Indian origin and not, as some held still in the early nineteenth century, to his African origin![8] Senart, in his *Essai sur la légende du Buddha,* also has a long discussion on the *mahāpuruṣa-lakṣaṇa,* here to advance the thesis that the Buddhist conception of the superhuman is essentially that of Puruṣa Nārāyaṇa, as seen in such brahmanical sources as the *Mahābhārata.*[9] There has been surprising little speculation on the nature and origin of these marks outside of art historical circles since, even though we are at a loss in many cases to understand why these signs, a number of which strike the modern reader as odd in the extreme, are emblematic of bodily perfection.[10]

The ability to perceive the marks on the Buddha's body was, in some texts, a special trait of certain sages. We learn in the *Brahmāyu-sutta* (*Majjhima-nikāya,* no. 91) that a brahmin named Brahmāyu, who was versed in the three Vedas, in their auxiliary sciences, and in reading the marks of a superhuman, sent his pupil Uttara to determine if the recluse Gotama was in fact a sage of the highest caliber as was reported of him: "Dear Uttara, the thirty-two marks of a superhuman have been handed down in our own hymns; the Great Man, endowed with these, has only two destinies—no other."[11] Uttara sets out to see the Buddha with his own eyes, to determine if he is endowed with the thirty-two marks that distinguish a complete and perfectly enlightened sage. Seeing the Buddha endowed with most of the marks, he remains in doubt about two: whether his penis is enclosed in a sheath and whether his tongue is truly long. Given the necessities of discretion, the Buddha reveals his sheathed penis to Uttara's mind using his supernormal powers. Next the Buddha extends his tongue, licking both ears, his nostrils, and covering the whole of his forehead with it.[12] Convinced, Uttara returns to his teacher Brahmāyu, who, wishing to see for himself, searches out the sage Gotama, has the same doubts, receives the same confirmation, and ultimately attains realization of the Dhamma.

This list of thirty-two auspicious marks, sometimes joined with the eighty minor signs *(anuvyañjana),* became a recurring topos in hagiographical accounts of the Buddha and in many of the artistic attempts to exalt his extraordinary achievement.[13] The Buddha came to be exalted in this way by at least the early post-Aśokan period (ca. late third to first centuries B.C.E.) as the tradition increasingly articulated the nature of his long bodhisattva career, the process by which he constructed a supermundane body in his quest for gnosis. The two

happened simultaneously and symbiotically. The Buddha, in other words, had come to literally embody his spiritual achievement. I will return to a discussion of the Buddha's bodhisattva career in Chapter 2.

Bodily Perfection in Mahāyāna Sources

The thirty-two marks were viewed as an essential indication of buddhahood, either achieved or imminent, in Mahāyāna sources as well. In some texts, for example, of the Perfection of Wisdom genre, we find them listed in full, albeit with variations as to order.[14] The Mahāyāna had the special problem of explaining how its *sūtra* compilers could have seen these auspicious signs on the Buddha's body. One strategy aimed at settling doubts on such matters was to set the narrative frame within the lifetime of the historical Buddha, often by having a long-lived supernatural being describe his or her encounter with the Buddha.[15] A good example of this can be found in the *Vimaladattāparipṛcchā-sūtra,* a text from the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection that is often associated with the sexual transformation motif.[16] Here Vimaladattā, the eight-year-old daughter of King Prasenajit, goes out of the city of Śrāvastī, accompanied by five hundred brahmins, in order to bathe the image of a deity. Seeing a gathering of monks, both *śrāvaka*s and bodhisattvas among them, outside the city gate, she is advised by the eldest brahmin, Brahmadeva, that such a sight is inauspicious and that they should return to the city. Vimaladattā responds in verse that these monks are virtuous and worthy of praise. By having long made offerings to the Buddha, these monks have become the highest fields of merit. Brahmadeva disapproves and attempts to persuade Vimaladattā not to bring shame upon herself and her family. Vimaladattā rejoins that without the salvific power of the Three Jewels, of what use are parents and wealth? At this point Brahmadeva inquires into the source of Vimaladattā's faith:

> "Young girl, since you were born, you have never even seen the Buddha, nor even heard the Dharma, nor have you done homage to the monastic assembly. Why, then, do you have faith in the Buddha?"
>
> The young girl Vimaladattā replied: "Brahmin, seven days after I was born, when I was on a golden couch in a sandalwood palace, I saw five hundred deities hovering in the sky. In manifold ways I heard them utter praise of the Buddha, utter praise of the Dharma, and utter praise of the monastic assembly. Then the gods asked one from among these deities who had formerly seen the Realized One: 'Friend, how should we understand what the Realized One is like?' Then this deity, knowing my thoughts, and in order to generate faith also in the gods, spoke these verses:

The hair on his head is spotless, unctuous, and beautiful;
Pure and soft, it curls toward the right.
The color of his face is like the petals of a lotus in bloom,
Like the full moon, lovely in the night sky.

The tuft of hair between his eyebrows *[ūrṇākośa]* is brilliant like snow or crystal;
It curls from between his eyebrows, superbly beautiful;
It overwhelms the assembly, and further makes the face of the Victor extremely lovely.

The eyes of the Lord of Men are also beautiful, his jaws like a lion's.
His mind is strong and fearless; his teeth even and without interstices.
His tongue is large and covers his whole face.
His face shines, spotless.

His speech is salutary and agreeable to the ear.
He avoids harsh words, is unshakable, and without malice.
Generating faith in countless people,
The voice of the Victor resounds in order to benefit the world.

His throat is like a conch,
And the fingers of the Lord of Men are long.
His arms are like the trunk of an elephant;
His chest is broad and without blemish; his navel is sunk in and deep.

His penis is sheathed like a thoroughbred's,
And his pores are like gold.
The shape of his thighs is like the trunk of an elephant;
His feet are firmly set and his calves are like an antelope's.[17]

The Lord of the Sages, whose speech is true and who is devoid of the vice of intoxication,
Destroys the heresies of those overcome with wrong views.
When petitioned in the assembly by millions of questions,
He satisfied every sentient being because he is without error and is devoid of vice.

Because his words are upright and without deceit, his body gladdens [the assembly],
Pleasing and soothing them with the highest bliss that is *nirvāṇa*.

Teaching *nirvāṇa,* which is pleasing for all persons,
He also teaches the middle path that avoids the two extremes.

He became a buddha on his own;
Having ferried himself [to the other shore], he also rescued others.
Praised as a protection and refuge for beings,
He acted for the sake of and out of compassion for the whole world.

These are the qualities of the Teacher;
Moreover, because they are infinite, I cannot describe them fully.
Hearing this, the gods became pleased and devout;
They generated devotion toward the Victor."

Then, after these verses had been spoken, Vimaladattā said to the brahmin Brahmadeva: "Brahmin, seven days after I was born, I heard about such qualities of the Buddha. Calling them to mind, from then on I was never overcome by languor or sleep. I was never taken in by desire, by malice, or by enmity. Calling them to mind, from then on I never took pleasure in my father, mother, brothers, sisters, or relatives; in wealth, ornaments, clothing, body or life, towns or homes. On the contrary, Brahmin, I called to mind the Buddha alone by his appearance. Brahmin, I reflected upon what was to be considered in a threefold manner: wherever the Tathāgata was and whichever Dharma he taught, I grasped it all completely; I did not lose the meaning or even a single letter or syllable from any word; I never failed to reflect upon the Tathāgata surrounded by the monastic assembly. Day and night, wherever I was, I always saw the Buddha, always heard the Dharma, and always paid homage to the monastic assembly. Brahmin, I cannot get enough of seeing the Buddha, hearing the Dharma, and honoring the monastic assembly."

Then the brahmin Brahmadeva said to a brahmin youth: "Young man, go and report this story to the king and queen." Then the brahmin youth, going in a speedy manner, told the king and queen the whole story as he witnessed it. As the young girl Vimaladattā uttered praise of the Buddha and uttered praise of the Dharma and the monastic assembly, just then these five hundred brahmins, including the brahmin Brahmadeva, gave rise to the aspiration for complete and perfect enlightenment.[18]

The problem presented here is seemingly quite simple: if one has never seen the Buddha, why would one generate faith in him and thereby become inspired to seek the Dharma? Buddhist literature exhibits considerable ambivalence across

time and genres with regard to the problem of seeing the Buddha. In this regard one thinks especially of the oft-cited passage at *Saṃyutta-nikāya* III, 120 in which the Buddha visits the dying monk Vakkali only to reproach him for his fixation on the Buddha's "foul body." The Buddha retorts: "He who sees the Dhamma, Vakkali, sees me; he who sees me, sees the Dhamma."[19] But this passage is itself ambiguous. It appears to want to say that having a direct realization of the truth is what it means to truly see the Buddha. And yet, it goes on to state that to see the Buddha is in some sense to access the Dhamma, the truth embodied in the person of the Realized One. This ambiguity, rather than being resolved, is fruitfully co-opted in this passage from the *Vimaladattāparipṛcchā* not by challenging the status of the Buddha's body, but by problematizing the nature of the devotee's gaze. The recollection here of the superb qualities of the Buddha, which include a number of the classic thirty-two marks of the superhuman, aims at elevating the Buddha as an object of contemplation, a plenitude that overwhelms the devotee and inspires the fixation of the inner gaze—even, or perhaps especially, when the Buddha is no longer present. Hindu devotional practice by contrast makes the divine physically available for view; the deity is encountered in the two-way gaze between devotee and manifest image. The *Vimaladattāparipṛcchā* plays off this contrast explicitly: the above cited episode is set in the context of a trip outside the city to bathe the image of a local deity.[20]

Posing the problem here in the body of an eight-year old girl—a topos common to this subgenre—allows the authors to subvert the assumptions of a typical Indian audience. Vimaladattā displays an advanced faith at a junior age. Despite being a prepubescent girl, that is, not yet a social person, she displays wisdom beyond that of senior male recluses. She demonstrates finally that a truly penetrating gaze requires no physically present object. The Buddha, even in his absence, is still superbly pleasing to the senses. His body gladdens the assembly, striking those who call his glorious marks to mind with awe and devotion, a reaction that can then be channeled toward spiritual progress. Indeed, Vimaladattā is thereby possessed of both zeal and detachment; she grasps the Dharma taught by the Buddha in its entirety, and she keeps the Three Jewels constantly in mind. Moreover, her manifested faith in this context gives rise to a quasi-magical result: five hundred brahmins have a conversion experience, that is, they generate the aspiration for enlightenment.[21]

Despite attempts by most Mahāyāna texts to set the narrative action in the time of the historical Buddha, thus insuring the authenticity of their account, authors of Mahāyāna *sūtras* were well aware that their fellow bodhisattvas would need access to living buddhas not only to verify such claims for themselves, but also to make use of these encounters to further their own bodhisattva careers. One of the principal strategies to accomplish this was the use of visionary techniques that

called an idealized image of a buddha to the mind's eye *(buddhānusmṛti),* thus enabling a kind of shamanic transport to a realm where a living buddha was present. These techniques, despite being central to the revelatory nature of many Mahāyāna *sūtra*s, have received surprisingly little scholarly treatment.[22]

One of the clearest examples of such a contemplation technique for encountering living buddhas can be found in the *Pratyutpannabuddha-saṃmukhāvasthita-samādhi-sūtra,* a Mahāyāna text translated into Chinese by 179 C.E.[23] This early classic discusses at some length the meditative absorption by which one can have a direct encounter with buddhas of the present, the purpose of which "is to enable practitioners to have audience with these buddhas and hear their teachings in this very life, and, secondarily, to achieve rebirth in their buddha-fields on their death."[24] Central to this meditative technique is visualizing the idealized body of the Buddha:

> Bhadrapāla, how then should *bodhisattvas* and *mahāsattvas* cultivate this *samādhi?* Bhadrapāla, just as I am at present sitting before you and teaching the Dharma, in the same way, Bhadrapāla, *bodhisattvas* should concentrate on the *Tathāgatas, Arhats* and Perfectly Awakened Ones as sitting on the Buddha-throne and teaching the Dharma. They should concentrate on the *Tathāgatas* as being endowed with all the finest aspects, handsome, beautiful, lovely to behold, and endowed with bodily perfection. They should look at the bodies of the *Tathāgatas, Arhats* and Perfectly Awakened Ones with their Marks of the Great Man (Skt. *mahāpuruṣa-lakṣaṇa*), each one of them produced by a hundred merits. They should also apprehend the external features (Skt. *nimitta*) [of the Marks]. They should also enquire about the invisible crown of the head [?]. Having enquired, they should also once more apprehend the external features of the Marks of the Great Man. Having apprehended them they should train themselves in this way:
>
> "Oh how marvelous the beauty of those *Tathāgatas, Arhats* and Perfectly Awakened Ones! I too at a future time shall be endowed with such bodily perfection. I shall perfect such marks. I too shall be endowed with such morality. I shall be endowed thus with *samādhi,* thus with wisdom, thus with emancipation, and thus with the cognition and vision of emancipation. I too shall in the same way become fully awakened to supreme and perfect awakening. And once I am fully awakened I shall expound the Dharma to the four assemblies and the world with its *devas!*"—thus should they train themselves.[25]

This visualization, the text makes clear in other places, can be aided by use of images or painted pictures of the Buddha.[26]

What is especially noteworthy about this passage, however, is that the marks that characterize the Buddha's perfected body are not merely projected onto a being of a wholly different order. This is not, in other words, an injunction to cult practice centered on one or more buddhas. On the contrary, the bodhisattva is enjoined to acquire these signs for himself as he works toward his own buddhahood. They are the sine qua non of his attainment, the visible signs of his spiritual transformation, and the symbols of maximal greatness for a human being.

For this reason, we find many instances in Mahāyāna *sūtra* literature in which these marks of perfection are extended to advanced bodhisattvas, individuals, presumably, on the cusp of buddhahood themselves. For example, among Dharmākara's famous set of vows in the *Sukhāvatīvyūha,* we find the following: "Blessed One, may I not awaken to unsurpassable, perfect, full awakening if, after I attain awakening, bodhisattvas born in my buddha-field will not all be endowed with the thirty-two marks of the superior human being."[27] Subsequently, the bodhisattva Dharmākara does in fact accumulate the incalculable merits required to perfect his body and his buddha-field, bringing him to the brink of buddhahood:

> He gathered acts of merit like these, so that as he practiced the conduct of the bodhisattva, during measureless, countless, inconceivable, incomparable, immense, limitless, and inexpressible hundreds of thousands of millions of trillions of cosmic ages, his mouth breathed the aroma of sandalwood, sweeter than any heavenly perfume. From all the pores on his skin arose the perfume of the blue lotus, and he was pleasing to everyone, gracious, handsome, endowed with an extraordinarily beautiful complexion, with a body that was adorned with all the major marks and minor signs of the superior human being. . . . In this way, Ānanda, the monk Dharmākara, as he practiced the conduct of the bodhisattva in the remote past, had that full possession and mastery over all the necessities and requisites of life that is unique to bodhisattvas.[28]

In fulfillment of his vows and with the attainment of buddhahood, Dharmākara, now the Buddha Amitābha, offers a number of extraordinary advantages to bodhisattvas reborn in his buddha-field, including the following: "all bodhisattvas who have been born in this buddha-field are endowed with the thirty-two marks of the superior human being, possessing perfect bodies."[29]

Such extensions of the *mahāpuruṣa-lakṣaṇa* to bodhisattvas is a recurring motif in quite a number of other Mahāyāna *sūtras*, including texts such as the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-sūtra*[30] and the *Śuraṃgamasamādhi-sūtra.*[31] The point of such references is to reinforce the notion that the bodily perfection of advanced bodhisattvas, like that of a buddha, is a physical testimony to their aeons-long

quest for buddhahood and the inexhaustible fund of spiritual power that results from it.[32] While much scholarly attention with regard to the *Sukhāvatīvyūha* has focused upon the saviorlike qualities of Amitābha and the "grace" he extends to his devotees, in the passages considered above, and in many more that could be mustered, the bodhisattva career espoused is fully compatible with other classic Mahāyāna depictions.

Some Mahāyāna *sūtra*s also want to claim that *all* beings in a given buddha-field will be in possession of the thirty-two marks of a superhuman. We find such references in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra,*[33] the *Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūrya-prabharāja-sūtra,*[34] and the *Karuṇāpuṇḍarīka-sūtra.*[35] This expropriation of the special qualities of a buddha would appear to reflect two separate but probably related developments: the universalization of the bodhisattva path to all Buddhists, and in some cases, to all beings, a claim by no means made by all or even most Mahāyāna *sūtra*s; and a further attempt to glorify a particular buddha's cult vis-à-vis other sodalities, a rhetorical contest characteristic of the sectarian nature of much of Mahāyāna *sūtra* literature. That some Mahāyāna groups moved more strongly in such directions, however, requires further explanation. In sociological terms, we might speculate that the more a given Mahāyāna fraternity saw itself as in tension with either other bodhisattva groups or with the dominant, Mainstream tradition, the more likely it was to offer some form of compensation to its members or potential members for a perceived scarcity of status, influence, or socio-economic power. To offer the marks of a superhuman in such a pandemic fashion was tantamount to insuring eventual buddhahood for all the members of one's company, provided that the members of such a Mahāyāna fraternity met and maintained the criteria of the in-group.[36]

It was not only advanced bodhisattvas and inhabitants of buddha-fields who sought and attained the *mahāpuruṣa-lakṣaṇa.* In at least one early Mahāyāna *sūtra,* bodhisattvas who still live in the household are advised to set out toward buddhahood and, in so doing, strive for the very bodily perfection that defines a buddha's accomplishment. In the *Ugraparipṛcchā-sūtra* this appears in a discussion concerning the way a house-dwelling bodhisattva should go to the Buddha for refuge:

> Householder, how does the house-dwelling bodhisattva go to the Buddha for refuge? Householder, now the house-dwelling bodhisattva thinks to himself, "I must obtain the body of the Buddha, adorned with the thirty-two marks of the superhuman," and exerts himself in order to accumulate those roots of merit by which the thirty-two marks of the superhuman are to be attained. In this way, householder, the bodhisattva goes to the Buddha for refuge.[37]

Once again, as in the case of the *Pratyutpannabuddha-samādhi-sūtra* cited above, it is clear that the concern here is not for a cultic relationship with the Buddha, but rather in acquiring the necessary requisites to become a buddha oneself. This is important. The scholarship on the *Ugraparipṛcchā-sūtra* has until recently assumed that the text espoused a bodhisattva path for lay people, understood as opening the Greater Vehicle to all comers. And yet, a reading of the whole text shows that while the setting of the *sūtra* may start out in the household, the orientation of values is clearly toward the ascetic. Every feature of lay life is unmasked as a trap, every relationship a burden. For the author of the *Ugraparipṛcchā,* it is not enough "to be in the world but not of it." The true bodhisattva ultimately recognizes not only the inferiority of secular values, but also the necessity of the renunciation of householder status. In this regard it is consonant with an asceticizing strand of early Mahāyāna literature that most definitely characterizes the *Rāṣṭrapāla.* I shall return to this issue at some length in Chapter 3.

Buddhist literature viewed the Buddha's glorified body not only as the karmic reward for his long bodhisattva career, but as a kind of catalyst. The sight of the Buddha's unexcelled beauty initiates a transformation within sentient beings that leads to their spiritual maturation. This maturation, in a Mahāyāna context, takes the form of an aspiration to acquire these marks for oneself, to undergo the same aeons-long quest that the Buddha practiced so as to build a body that will similarly satisfy the needs of sentient beings. This bodhisattva career, if taken seriously according to the *Ugraparipṛcchā,* requires the complete renunciation of home and society for a life of ascetic discipline in the forest—a lifestyle that imitates what some early Mahāyāna authors saw to be that of the historical Buddha himself. It is in this context, then, that we now turn to the *Rāṣṭrapāla* so as to discern the ways in which its authors manipulated this physiognomy of virtue within an ascetic praxis.

The Glorification of the Buddha's Body in the *Rāṣṭrapāla*

In its exaltation of the Buddha's bodily form, the *Rāṣṭrapāla* shares much in common with a great many Mahāyāna *sūtra*s. The Buddha is described as radiant, as one who surpasses a thousand suns, who illumines the entire assembly with his brilliance.[38] This nearly ubiquitous motif is expressed in the *Rāṣṭrapāla* as follows:

> Shining like Meru, a dwelling for the host of gods even in the middle of the ocean, he emits hundreds of thousands of rays of light standing in the middle of an ocean of compassion.

> And this Superlative One [Brahmā] who has attained the supreme mental attitudes shone like one superior to Brahmā; this Most Excellent Being, who delights in meditation, liberation, and concentration, shines over the whole world.
>
> Possessed of great brilliance, shining in the midst of the gods like Śakra in the heaven of the thirty[-three gods], the King of the Sages, adorned with the marks and rich in gnosis and virtues, shines over the whole world.[39]

Theories about the role of such light imagery in Mahāyāna literature, especially rich in texts concerned with other buddhas and their buddha-fields, have ranged from the influence of *bhakti* devotional traditions on Buddhism to the importation of Iranian religious motifs. Much of this speculation remains unconvincing. There is still much to be understood about the use of such narrative spectacles.[40] Progress in this respect is likely to come from a more nuanced understanding of the dramaturgical features of Mahāyāna discourse, in particular, its propensity to set a richly imagined stage, replete with an abundant cast, orchestra, and special effects crew. In this regard I am in sympathy with the characterization of this genre by Paul Harrison, who has compared Mahāyāna *sūtra* literature to the Hindi film: "Mahāyāna *sūtras* are also informed by this aesthetic of exaggeration, and, like Hindi movies, they are best appreciated as wholes, as a kind of total experience, since individual features, once abstracted, may become meaningless or even ridiculous."[41]

However, as the last quoted verse illustrates, the Buddha was also depicted in the *Rāṣṭrapāla* in more traditional terms, as "adorned with the marks" that characterize all buddhas. In a series of verses in the "Prologue" uttered by Rāṣṭrapāla in praise of the Buddha, some of these auspicious signs are enumerated in detail:

> There is no one equal, much less superior, to you, whose body is adorned with the marks like the sky dotted with stars. We pay homage to the Best of Sages, the Highest among Men.
>
> Even your corporeal form, which is pleasing to the mind, is unequaled; it eclipses the world together with the gods. In your presence, Brahmā, Śakra, and the Akaniṣṭha gods are not the least resplendent.
>
> You are stainless, like a mountain of gold; your unctuous, delicate hair turns clockwise on your head. Your cranial protuberance rises like Meru, the king [of mountains], and shines as a result of your extensive merit.

> Emitting billions of millions of light rays, your *ūrṇa* shines on the ridge of your eyebrows. The eye with which you, intent on compassion, see the world is lovely as a lotus.
>
> Your face, Trainer, shines like the full moon in the bright sky; people who see you cannot be satiated. We pay homage to the Highest among Men, endowed with a beautiful face.
>
> You walk over the surface of the earth, causing it to tremble, with the gait of a goose, a peacock, a lion, with the sauntering stride of an elephant in rut. We pay homage to the one Possessed of the Ten Powers, whose religious observance is firm.
>
> The fingers of your hand are beautifully long and round, with pure, copper-colored fingernails and adorned with webbing in between. When you stand up, [your hands] reach your kneecaps. We pay homage to him who resembles the color of gold.
>
> You walk on the surface of the earth, adorning it with footprints inlaid with wheels and webbing.[42] Human beings who were matured by the light rays emanating from your feet go to the world of the gods when they die.[43]

The appearance of the Buddha here is awe-inspiring in at least two ways. First, it marks his extraordinary status in the world, exalting his unparalleled accomplishment (at least in this world-system) as derived from his accumulation of a vast store of merit. Second, the Buddha's glorified body elicits homage and veneration from sentient beings who see him, thereby providing a source for their own auspicious karmic fruition.

Chapter 2 of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* presents an extended allegory with a scene reminiscent of the passage cited above from the *Vimaladattāparipṛcchā-sūtra,* in which a young princess hears a description of the Buddha's magnificent qualities from a divinity. In the *Rāṣṭrapāla,* the young prince Puṇyaraśmi, who, we later learn, is to become the Tathāgata Śākyamuni, hears the following description of the former Buddha Siddhārthabuddhi from the Śuddhāvāsakāyika gods:

> His unctuous, beautiful hair grows turning toward the right; his cranial protuberance is as resplendent as gold spread over a mountain. The tuft of hair between his eyebrows shines like the sun in the sky, and his navel, translucent as crystal, spirals clockwise.

His eyes are like blue lotuses, clear as a swarm of bees. The Lord of Men, the Self-Existent One, has the jaws of a lion and lips like a bimba fruit. He emits endless thousands of millions of light rays and illuminates the three-thousand-world chiliocosms, extinguishing the unfortunate destinies therein.

His teeth are even, without interstices, well-rounded, bright, and very white, pure as snow or silver, and number forty. The most excellent of the supreme Victors has four canine teeth, and he has a long tongue that can cover his own face.

He has a superlative voice, coherent like the most excellent speech, comforting, sensible, straightforward, and harmonious. The voice of the Victor, equal to hundreds of thousands of musical instruments, allays doubt and is satisfying to those who want.

The voice of the Victor, possessed of manifold, flawless virtues conforming to the limbs of enlightenment, is festooned with qualities strung together like a hundred thousand pearls. It resounds with a pleasure like that derived from musical instruments. Pleasing, like the songs of the gods, it is as refreshing as the charming voice of the gods.

It has the sound of celestial musicians *[kiṃnara],* of cuckoo birds, of *kokila* birds, of *cakra* birds, of peacocks, of geese, and of *konālaka* birds. The sound of his supreme voice has the vocal qualities of celestial musicians; unwavering and without imperfection, it yields comprehension of all meanings.

Smooth like translucent crystal, agreeable to the sages, inspiring, taming, purifying, affectionate, in conformity with the highest course, satisfying when questioned—these are the qualities of the speech of this Lord of the Dharma.

The neck of the Teacher is as beautiful as a conch shell, his shoulders rounded, his arms like long iron bars, and he possesses seven limbs with protuberances. His hands are beautiful and well-rounded, his fingers long and round. The body of this Victor has the color of refined gold.

The hairs on his body grow individually, turning toward the right. His navel is complete and inaccessible, and his penis is concealed in a sheath like that of a horse. The Self-Existent One has thighs like the trunk of an

> elephant and calves like an antelope; the palms of his hands are adorned with swastikas and wheels.
>
> Sauntering with the gait of the lord of elephants, with the strides of a lion, and with the grace of a bull, he is mighty as [the *nāga*] Indrayaṣṭi. A rain of flowers from the sky becomes parasols of flowers; when he walks, they follow him. These are his marvelous qualities.
>
> For the Victor, in profit and in loss, in comfort and in pain, in disgrace and in fame, and likewise in censure and in praise, this lion among men is entirely unbesmeared, as a lotus is by water. Thus there is no sentient being here equal to him.[44]

Here too we see the celebration of assorted signs marking the superiority of the Buddha's bodily form, from the clockwise-turning hair on his head to his even teeth, melodious voice, rounded shoulders, mighty thighs, and supple calves. This eulogy by the gods so enraptured Puṇyaraśmi that he threw himself from the top of the palace in order to move the Tathāgata Siddhārthabuddhi to rescue him. Siddhārthabuddhi saves Puṇyaraśmi in two senses: he extends a beam of light that lowers Puṇyaraśmi safely to the ground, inspiring the awe-struck prince to surrender himself at the Blessed One's feet. But he also expounds the path to buddhahood, enabling the prince to acquire supernormal powers that he uses to strew flowers upon the Buddha from the sky. The pattern here again is clear: the Buddha's extraordinary appearance has elicited a powerful emotional reaction in Puṇyaraśmi by which he is spiritually transformed. This transformation then makes possible an equally extraordinary act of veneration, which generates the merit that will propel Puṇyaraśmi along the bodhisattva course.[45]

Having had a face-to-face encounter with the Buddha Siddhārthabuddhi, Puṇyaraśmi descends from the sky and eulogizes him now in his own words:

> I salute you, [whose body] resembles the color of gold and is possessed of the supreme marks, whose face is like the bright full moon. I salute you, bearer of unparalleled gnosis; there is no one like you, free of blemish, in the triple world.
>
> Your hair, Victor, is soft, lovely, unctuous, and beautiful; your cranial protuberance is like the king of mountains [i.e., Meru]. There is not seen a cranial protuberance equal to yours. The tuft of hair on your most excellent eyebrow, Sage, is radiant.

> Your superb eyes, by which you see this world with compassion, are as white as jasmine, the moon, a conch shell, or snow—beautiful as blue lotuses. I salute you, the pure-eyed Victor.
>
> Your tongue is long, thin, and copper-colored, and with it you can cover your own face. Proclaiming the Dharma, you discipline the world. I salute you, who has a sweet, lovely voice.
>
> Your teeth, bright and hard as diamond, number forty and are adjoined without interstices. When you smile, you discipline the world. I salute you, whose speech is sweet and true.
>
> You are unequaled in appearance, Victor; you illuminate hundreds of [buddha-]fields with your radiance. Brahmā, Indra, and the protectors of the world, Blessed One, are obscured by your radiance.
>
> Your antelope-like calves, Blessed One, are unmatched; you have the gait of the lord of the elephants, the peacock, or the lord of beasts [i.e., the lion]. You walk looking ahead only a plow's length, Blessed One, making the earth and mountain slopes tremble.
>
> Your body is replete with marks, Blessed One, and your smooth skin is the color of gold. The world cannot get enough of looking upon this form of yours, possessor of unparalleled beauty.
>
> I salute you, supremely compassionate one, who practiced austerities *[tapā]* for hundreds of former aeons, who took pleasure in every form of renunciation, restraint, and generosity, and who is devoted to pity and loving-kindness toward all sentient beings.[46]

Puṇyaraśmi's own praise of the Buddha Siddhārthabuddhi once again rehearses a number of the classic *mahāpuruṣa-lakṣaṇa:* the Buddha's *uṣṇīṣa* (cranial proturberance), *ūrṇā* (tuft of hair between his eyebrows), long tongue, lovely voice, cleftless teeth, and antelope-like legs. But in this description we see an explicit connection between the Buddha's body replete with marks and the aeons-long practice of austerities *(pūrvakalpaśatacīrṇatapā)* by which those marks were attained. The authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla,* then, share the view of the *Ugraparipṛcchā* with regard to the necessity of rigorous discipline: wilderness dwelling, which I will discuss in detail below, must be endured now by bodhisattvas as the Buddha himself endured extreme sacrifices for hundreds of aeons to develop the requisites for

complete enlightenment.[47] The marks of a superhuman, in other words, are an outwardly visible eruption from an overabundance of virtues *(guṇa)* and gnosis *(jñāna)* for which the bodhisattva devotes his spiritual career in the hope of rescuing all sentient beings. The inner fire *(tapas)* by which a buddha has burned away his defilements is the same fire that radiates from his glorified body. This bodily splendor and radiance can literally touch sentient beings in need of spiritual maturation, ripening whatever meager roots of goodness they possess, thus drawing them toward the Buddha and the paths he makes available.[48]

This connection between a bodhisattva's vows and his eventual accomplishment of the perfected body of a buddha is again made explicit in a subsequent passage in which King Arciṣmat, the future Buddha Amitāyus, lauds the Buddha Siddhārthabuddhi:

> I salute this ocean of virtues and gnosis, a hero among men, with whom there is no equal, much less a superior in this triple world, who is honored by the lord of the gods and the king of the *asura*s, the most excellent being. A person cannot get enough of looking upon your corporeal form.
>
> The thirty-two marks on your body are extremely clear; like Mt. Meru, [your body] is adorned as with superb jewels, completely pure. I salute the smooth body of the sage, which resembles the color of gold, the sight of whose agreeable form is pleasing to the Victors.
>
> Hundreds of millions of vows were observed [by you] for incalculable aeons; hundreds of millions of buddhas were honored [by you] for many aeons. You have offered inconceivable and immeasurable hundreds of sacrifices, and because of this, your beautiful body shines.
>
> Your form was purified by your generosity, morality, concentration, and wisdom, by your tolerance, heroic exertion, meditation, and stratagems. In your presence, the splendor and radiance of the sun and moon stones are not brilliant; the radiance of Śakra and Brahmā is not bright.
>
> You appear in a pleasing form for the sake of the world, resembling in appearance the moon in the water, like an illusion. In every direction the body of the Victor is seen, but the extent of the form of the Well-Accomplished Ones is not seen.[49]

The *Rāṣṭrapāla* thus clearly and repeatedly links the Buddha's possession of marks, on the one hand, with the radiance of his glorified body and his su-

premely beautiful appearance and, on the other hand, with his acquisition of an abundance of virtue and gnosis, attained by the aeons-long pursuit of renunciation and austerities. As John Strong has cogently noted, the Buddha's heroic accomplishment was perceived to be as much physical as it was spiritual:

> The practice of giving and of other perfections illustrated in these *jātakas,* has, however, an additional significance when looked at in terms of the Buddha's lifestory. Simply put, by accomplishing these deeds, the bodhisattva is thought to be building the body he will have as the Buddha. More specifically, this physical body is described in terms of the thirty-two marks of the great man *(mahāpuruṣa)* which characterize all buddhas and other great beings such as *cakravartin* kings. . . . it is important to realize that buddhahood is not just a mental enlightenment experience, a realization of the Dharma, a doctrinal truth. It is also a karmic achievement that is accomplished and expressed somatically.[50]

These linkages are integral to the broader strategy of the *Rāṣṭrapāla,* which champions a bodhisattva path imitating the process by which the past and present buddhas acquired their supreme attainments. To this end, as we shall see in the following chapter, the authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* explicitly cited the historical Buddha's own bodhisattva career—his sequence of former lives in pursuit of enlightenment, recorded in the *jātaka* tales and frequently represented in both Buddhist literature and art. These tales then provided the model for future bodhisattvas, demonstrating the efficaciousness of a long series of lives dedicated to self-sacrifice.

CHAPTER TWO

Former Life Narratives and the Bodhisattva Career

All good and holy men, regarded as saints and arahants, lived in the past.
—W. Rahula, *History of Buddhism in Ceylon*

Jātaka Narratives in Art and Literature

The glorification of the Buddha's body discussed in the previous chapter was viewed as the direct result of his long and often grueling bodhisattva career, a career that focused on his continuous practice of a series of moral and spiritual perfections. Because fifty of the Buddha's former lives are referred to explicitly in the *Rāṣṭrapāla,* it is relevant at this point to note their relationship with other, almost certainly earlier, genres of Buddhist literature that may have provided their inspiration. We will also want to understand how these *jātaka* references function within the narrative program of the *Rāṣṭrapāla,* specifically its attempt to detail a rigorous path for contemporary bodhisattvas, inspired by the heroic exploits of the Buddha's own career.

This career was detailed at great length in a set of related texts of early post-Aśokan (ca. late third to first centuries B.C.E.) literature referred to by Jonathan Walters as the ABCs—*Apadāna, Buddhavaṃsa,* and *Cariyāpiṭaka*—to which we should also add *Jātaka.*[1] The first three of these genres are generally considered to be among the latest additions to the Pāli canon, although their canonicity was not universally accepted.[2] The *Jātaka,* by contrast, are probably of mixed dates, reflecting their composite nature and frequent editorial insertions.[3] Although the concerns and agendas of these collections differ in some significant ways from each other, Walters is correct to see them collectively as constituting "the first crucial transformation of the Buddha biography in its long and varied history."[4]

As is well known, the hagiography of the Buddha begins not with his birth, but with his many former lives undergone in pursuit of his supreme attainment. Given that the biographical literature of this period must have provided the model for the bodhisattva path that became central to Mahāyāna self-understanding, it

is surprising that it has received so little attention from scholars of the Mahāyāna outside of Japan.[5] In fact, much of the Buddhist narrative literature that was composed in the early post-Aśokan period is often said to contain proto-Mahāyāna elements. Barua describes the *Apadāna, Buddhavaṃsa,* and *Cariyāpiṭaka* as "Mahāyāna Buddhism in the making," and more recently, Bechert has called the first text of the *Apadāna* collection, the *Buddhāpadāna,* "a full-fledged Mahāyāna text . . . quite different from all other works in the Pāli Tripiṭaka."[6] But as Cutler has pointed out, the *Buddhāpadāna* does not recommend the bodhisattva path as a general religious option; it does not refer to bodhisattvas other than Gotama, nor does it mention bodhisattvas as a group to be revered.[7]

It is much more likely that rather than anticipating developments in the early Mahāyāna, both the Pāli hagiographic literature and early Mahāyāna *sūtra*s arose from a shared nexus of innovations in the Buddhist tradition. Both genres may well represent parallel developments with different trajectories, and it is not at all inconceivable that these genres could have arisen in close proximity to each other in time and place. Insofar as some monastic fraternities may have welcomed certain doctrinal and cultic innovations related to the emergence of the bodhisattva ideal, these tendencies may have been expressed in orthodox circles among monks sympathetic to these groups. This possibility may be reflected in the early post-Aśokan hagiographies mentioned above.[8] But insofar as these ideas were not well received in other circles, especially if they were posed in more radical terms, those monks who held them may have been forced to seek alternative modes of expression. These latter expressions may have constituted an incipient Mahāyāna *sūtra* literature whose distinctive bodhisattva path was radicalized precisely in the face of opposition from an entrenched orthodoxy. This interpretation can only be speculative. Nevertheless, it is not necessary to position the origins of these genres in different strata of the Buddhist population, whatever that might have meant in ancient India.[9] If this is the case, then the real question for us to ask is this: why did some monks in this religious milieu stay within the Mainstream fold, maintaining the supreme goal as arhatship and elevating buddhahood beyond reach, while others advocated the more ambitious goal of buddhahood in imitation of Śākyamuni's own career? We may never be able to fully answer such a question, but I hope to offer some reasonable speculations to the underlying motivations in the course of the next two chapters.

It is not only in this literature that we find evidence of a special focus on the biography of the Buddha. Scholars have long acknowledged, if not fully appreciated, the extensive art historical remains that present scenes from the bodhisattva career of the Buddha, especially as portrayed in *jātaka* literature.[10] Famous sites would include the bas-reliefs carved on the railings around the great *stūpa*s at Sāñcī and Bhārhut in the north and Amarāvatī and Nāgārjunakoṇḍa in the south;

reliefs from ancient Gandhāra in the northwest; and the wall paintings in the monastic caves at Ajaṇṭā, among others.[11] To describe these reliefs as based on the *jātaka*s, however, may be to prejudice the actual historical situation. Jonathan Walters has recently suggested that it "may be that the carvings gave shape to the later texts that seem to correspond to them, rather than the other way around."[12] Indeed, our inability to precisely date Indian texts of this period and the general tendency of scholars to privilege literary over other kinds of sources makes such a possibility worthy of further consideration.[13]

Moreover, recent attempts to view the *jātaka* reliefs narratively, to expose the sequential and multidimensional plans of their reading, have opened new avenues for understanding the way devotees might have approached these monuments and encountered the scenes of the Buddha's extended life history.[14] Aspects of this approach, however, have been criticized on multiple grounds by Robert Brown.[15] Brown argues against seeing the *jātaka* reliefs around *stūpa*s as mere illustrated versions of their literary parallels and instead takes them as iconic units within the visual grammar of the monument, that is, specifically in nonnarrative roles. Vidya Dehejia herself recognized the difficulty of viewing certain of the railing scenes narratively during the usual act of circumambulating, for example, the great *stūpa* at Sāñcī, owing to the nonlinear sequence of panels within the same story. Brown, however, draws our attention to the fact that the panels are almost impossible to see from the ground in the first place—they are simply too high. In light of that fact, he supposes that the visual scenes at Sāñcī, Ajaṇṭā, and elsewhere "were there for worshipers, not viewers, and the choice of 'viewer' as the way to characterize most often the person relating to the Indian art is to 'art historicize' the material, to make it an issue between art historian and object. Instead, the issue for me is between worshiper and deity."[16] In effect, believing is seeing, to turn an old cliché on its head, or at least a necessary prerequisite for it.

This emphasis on the long bodhisattva career of the Buddha in both the literature and the art historical record reminds us that the cultic elevation of Śākyamuni was the common inheritance of the Buddhist tradition in this period. The Mahāyāna did not distinguish itself—contrary to many scholarly claims—by depreciating the centrality of Śākyamuni in favor of other buddhas, but in fact fully participated in and contributed to his apotheosis. It is only with these more recent efforts by art historians to read these monuments systematically that we begin to imagine the nature of this encounter between devotee and sacred site.

Japanese scholars, most notably Akira Hirakawa, have long supposed a close connection between *stūpa* sites and the emergence of the Mahāyāna.[17] It is important, therefore, that the reader not confuse my position with his. Whereas Hirakawa claimed that *stūpa* sites served as the institutional locus for

newly formed lay groups of Mahāyāna devotees—a position I believe to have been definitively refuted in Schopen 1975 and several more times since—I am suggesting that the representation of the Buddha's former lives at these cultic centers contributed to the rising interest in the *conception* of the bodhisattva path in both Mainstream and Mahāyāna circles, perhaps almost simultaneously. It is a separate question as to why some of the individuals who may have encountered these representations internalized the bodhisattva quest and some did not. To that problem we will return below.

This early post-Aśokan period, then, is crucial to our understanding of the early Mahāyāna, for it saw the formation of all of the essential features of the bodhisattva career of Śākyamuni, which would become paradigmatic for adherents of this new spiritual orientation. There are three past-life events that represent the sine qua non of Śākyamuni's future buddhahood. First, there are successive encounters with former buddhas, beginning, in Śākyamuni's case, incalculable aeons ago with the Buddha Dīpaṃkara when he was the ascetic Sumedha. At that time Sumedha laid his long locks of matted hair across a mud puddle in order to facilitate Dīpaṃkara's crossing.[18] The merit from this pious act is then transmuted into a kind of karmic "fuel," leading to the second important feature of the bodhisattva path: the resolve to direct the merit from such devotional acts toward buddhahood. Third, all bodhisattvas receive a prediction from a living buddha of their eventual buddhahood. Of course, the lack of a living buddha in this world made the bodhisattva path impossible for members of the Mainstream tradition. For the Mahāyāna it required innovations in Buddhist cosmology, most notably the positing of alternative buddha-fields where buddhas could be accessed and propitiated. In fact, these buddha-fields quickly became essential to the bodhisattva career in the Mahāyāna, since it was only in such a world-system that a buddha could be encountered and sufficient merit amassed to accomplish the path toward buddhahood for oneself.[19]

Once the bodhisattva has resolved to set out for supreme enlightenment and has received confirmation of his future success from a living buddha, he (rarely she) will engage in a series of spiritual perfections constituting the substance of the path toward buddhahood, a path that will traverse hundreds if not thousands of lifetimes. Again, the essential features of the bodhisattva's practice are laid out in the Pāli hagiographic literature. Let me begin by citing from the opening chapter of the *Buddhavaṃsa,* where the great disciple Sāriputta questions the Buddha about his former practice:

> Sāriputta, possessor of great wisdom and versed in concentration and meditation, having attained the perfection of wisdom, inquires of the Guide of the World:

> "Of what kind, Great Hero, was your aspiration *[abhinīhāro],* Highest among Men? When, Steadfast One,[20] did you seek the highest enlightenment?
>
> "Of what sort were your generosity, morality, renunciation, wisdom, and exertion? Of what kind your tolerance, truthfulness, resolution, loving-kindness, and equanimity?
>
> "Of what kind, Steadfast One, were your ten perfections, Guide of the World? How were your subsidiary perfections *[upapāramī]* fulfilled? How your ultimate perfections *[param'atthapāramī]*?"[21]

In response to Sāriputta's petition, the Buddha Śākyamuni enumerates his various incarnations under former buddhas, beginning with his initial quest as Sumedha under the Buddha Dīpaṃkara, each time describing the ways in which he had propitiated these buddhas and reaffirmed his own bodhisattva career. A similar account is provided by the *Buddhāpadāna,* this time with the Buddha himself recounting the perfections whereby he achieved supreme enlightenment:

> Having given gifts that were to be given, fulfilling the moral precepts entirely, and arriving at perfection in renunciation, I obtained the highest enlightenment.
>
> Questioning the wise, carrying out the most excellent exertion, and attaining to the perfection of tolerance, I obtained the highest enlightenment.
>
> Practicing true resolution, I fulfilled the perfection of truthfulness; attaining to the perfection of loving-kindness, I obtained the highest enlightenment.[22]

The *Cariyāpiṭaka* is similarly dedicated to describing in verse seven of the perfections recognized by the Theravādin tradition as practiced by the Buddha during his former lives. I will have occasion to return to a number of these narratives in my discussion of the *jātaka* allusions in the *Rāṣṭrapāla.*

The lists of perfections are notoriously unfixed. The Theravādin tradition recognizes ten, though as we saw above, only eight are listed in the *Buddhāpadāna* and seven in the *Cariyāpiṭaka.*[23] A group of six became more or less standard in some genres of Mainstream literature[24] and more typically in Mahāyāna *sūtras*, but lists of four, five, or seven are also attested.[25] Regardless of the number, all Buddhist traditions are unanimous in recognizing the funda-

mental connection between the practice of the perfections over aeons of former lives and the accomplishment of the glorified body and supreme enlightenment that characterize buddhahood. This connection also occupies a prominent place in the *Rāṣṭrapāla* itself, since the Buddha's bodhisattva career functioned as a paradigm for the contemporary bodhisattva path advocated by its authors.

Particular perfections are linked with specific former lives of the Buddha throughout Buddhist literature, although seldom consistently. For example, the story about Mahātyāgavat, who dried up the ocean to obtain a jewel at the bottom, which he then gave to others, is referred to at verse 116 in the *Rāṣṭrapāla.* It is said to illustrate the perfection of exertion *(vīrya)* in the *Dazhidu lun,* but the *Liu du ji jing*, a third-century Chinese anthology of *jātaka* tales, takes it as a demonstration of the bodhisattva's generosity *(dāna).*[26] What stands out from several of the collections of Buddhist narrative literature as well as from the *Rāṣṭrapāla* itself is the prominence of the perfection of generosity as the quintessential virtue of the bodhisattva path. Fully half of the fifty *jātaka* allusions in the *Rāṣṭrapāla* describe the bodhisattva's giving, from the abandonment of his former wealth as a king to the sacrifice of a body part to save the life of another. In each instance, the bodhisattva was indifferent to the loss. His sacrifice is perfected precisely by his intention to give willingly, even eagerly, whatever is asked of him, regardless of the worthiness of the recipient, for the sake of his final goal: omniscience.

The protagonists described in the *jātaka* allusions in the *Rāṣṭrapāla* are in thirty of the fifty cases men, generally kings or princes of great wealth and power. In two instances the bodhisattva was reborn as a woman,[27] and in the remaining eighteen cases as an animal.[28] Regardless of sex or species, the former life narratives enumerated in the *Rāṣṭrapāla* illustrate almost without exception extreme, nearly unimaginable, sacrifice and endurance. The bodhisattva's aeons-long pursuit of the perfections necessary for complete buddhahood demonstrates time and again a single-minded commitment to achieve his goal at whatever the cost.

Many of these accounts can only be described as macabre and grotesque. Such narratives distance the reader/auditor from the hero, making it very difficult to identify with the path he undertook. In a Mainstream context, this serves to widen the gulf between the extraordinary achievement of the Buddha and the accomplishment of those who follow his path toward arhatship. It provides, in a sense, clarification for the distinction between the two. Placed in a Mahāyāna setting, the very same story could have the effect of bolstering a beleaguered bodhisattva group to endure the hardships they faced as the Buddha formerly endured his. The bodhisattva's tolerance of the rejection and even abuse suffered at the hands of his co-religionists then becomes homologous to the Buddha's willingness to undertake extreme sacrifices. I will have occasion to discuss this latter scenario in the following chapters. In this regard no story

distances, even unsettles, us more than the *jātaka* about Viśvantara (Pāli Vessantara), referred to in the *Rāṣṭrapāla* as Sudaṃṣṭra ("Prologue," v. 121). This narrative is so well known that it can be summarized here succinctly.[29]

Sañjaya, the king of the Śibis, had a son, Viśvantara, who possessed all of the finest moral and intellectual qualities. From an early age, Viśvantara was preoccupied with generosity, making lavish gifts to the people of his kingdom. In this way his reputation spread far and wide, leading some brahmins from a nearby kingdom to take advantage of his liberality by requesting a magnificent elephant prized by his people. As Viśvantara contemplated the request, he saw through the ignoble motives of the brahmins: "And yet, what can these brahmins want with a lordly elephant such as this? Obviously this is some miserable ploy concocted by a king who is eaten up with greed and envy."[30] Despite this admission, Viśvantara relinquished the elephant without reservation, bent as he was on perfecting the necessary requisites for buddhahood. The king's ministers were furious that Viśvantara had given away a possession so prized by his people, declaiming that his excessive piety made him unfit to succeed the king. In response to the uproar from his ministers and subjects, King Sañjaya was forced to send his son into exile. Rather than reacting with indignation, Viśvantara maintained his composure and compassion, declaring to the bearer of the bad news: "Quite apart from outward possessions, I would give away my own eyes, my head—it is purely for the good of the world that I keep my body alive. . . . If a beggar demands it, I am ready to offer him my whole body."[31] Giving away his entire fortune to beggars, Viśvantara retreated to the wilderness, together with his wife Madrī and two children. In the forest Viśvantara was approached by an evil-minded brahmin, who beseeched him to hand over the children to be his servants. Viśvantara once again gladly assented, and despite the children's wailing and his own upwelling of emotion, he did not waver. Śakra, lord of the gods, was amazed by Viśvantara's gift, and desiring to test him himself, he appeared before Viśvantara disguised as a brahmin to ask for his wife. Once again, Viśvantara relinquished his family without hesitation. Overwhelmed by Viśvantara's generosity and selflessness, Śakra exclaimed:

> Oh! What a gulf lies between the good and the bad in the way they behave. The spiritually ignorant could not even believe such an act possible. Still to feel love, and yet to give away one's own dear wife and children like this, unselfishly—what true nobility! . . . Already this superhuman act of yours is being applauded by the whole hierarchy of heaven, including myself.[32]

Śakra revealed himself to Viśvantara and restored his wife to him. The Śibis, learning of their prince's extreme liberality, ransomed his children back from the brahmin, whereupon Viśvantara was reinstated as their king.

The *Viśvantara (Vessantara) jātaka* is without a doubt one of the most popular narratives in the Buddhist world. It would be no exaggeration to say that it is rivaled only by the biography of Śākyamuni himself, and in some regions, the story of Viśvantara eclipses even that. It is best known from its Pāli and Sanskrit redactions, of which there are more than a few, and a summary version has recently come to light in Gāndhārī literature.[33] In addition to the canonical redaction known from the *vinaya,* a dramaturgical version is also known in Tibetan.[34] The *Viśvantara-jātaka* appears in Chinese both as a free-standing text and in several collectanea.[35] This narrative is also known from several Central Asian sources, including Khotanese, Sogdian, and Tokharian.[36] The *Viśvantara-jātaka* appears often in art historical sources as well. It is represented, for example, among the earliest bas-reliefs at Sāñcī as well as among the finds at Mathurā, Amarāvatī, Ajaṇṭā, and in Gandhāra, to name only a few.[37] The Viśvantara narrative was not, however, merely frozen in mythic time. Chinese pilgrims to India of the fifth to seventh centuries report on specific sites, especially in Gandhāra and Udyāna, commemorated as loci for events within this narrative.[38] In other words, the Viśvantara legend was manifested as an active cult that located the extended life story of the Buddha within a sacralized topography. This narrative remains very popular to this day in Buddhist countries from Southeast Asia to Nepal.[39]

As is readily apparent from even this incomplete list of references, the authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* co-opted a former life narrative that constituted one of the most popular in Buddhist literature and, in so doing, buttressed their fundamental agenda: to draw upon classic, and therefore presumably untainted, inspiration for proper renunciant behavior. Although Viśvantara is a layman, the extremity of his giving allows him to assume a quasi-renunciant status. Indeed, Āryaśūra's rendition in the *Jātakamālā* makes the connection explicit: "For over half a year, attended by his dear wife, listening to the sweet, artless chatter of his children, and forgetting the cares of kingship, as though he were in the royal park, he practiced austerity *[tapaś cāra]* in that forest."[40] Just as the Buddha practiced austerities over many former lives, so too should the bodhisattva who aspires to imitate his achievement, whatever the cost.

Buddhists of many persuasions have long been uncomfortable with Viśvantara's sacrifice, with the presumption that his ends justified his means. Āryaśūra, in his retelling of this legend, frames the story in such a way as to make clear that he was well aware of its unsettling nature. He opens his narrative with the following line: "The bodhisattva career is hardly approved by even a few people, let alone actually undertaken."[41] At the end of the story, he closes: "Thus is the career of the bodhisattva extraordinary. One should neither despise nor obstruct superior beings who near it."[42]

The postcanonical *Milindapañha* includes an extended discussion on the

propriety of Vessantara's gift.[43] King Milinda asks the monk Nāgasena: "Do all bodhisattas give away their wives and children as Vessantara did?" Nāgasena replies, that yes, they all do. Milinda recounts the terrible suffering endured by Vessantara's children, wondering aloud: shouldn't the bodhisatta have offered himself instead? How can bringing sorrow upon others produce meritorious fruits? Nāgasena offers a series of largely ineffective analogies. For example, Nāgasena suggests, doesn't transporting a crippled man by means of an ox cart achieve a greater good at the expense of the oxen? Milinda doesn't buy the comparison. To his mind, there is still something excessive about Vessantara's gift, and "excessive giving, Venerable Nāgasena, is reproved and censured by the wise in the world."[44] Nāgasena argues that one is duty bound to give what is asked for—hence Vessantara's obligation to give his wife and children rather than himself. Moreover, Nāgasena also attempts to make the case that Vessantara foresaw that his children would not long suffer under the evil brahmin Jūjaka; he knew their grandfather, the king, would ransom them back. King Milinda ultimately accepts Nāgasena's casuistry. Vessantara's children are in reality too precious to be lost to the likes of a cruel brahmin, and Vessantara knew this. But one is left with the strong impression that Milinda should be unsatisfied. The line of argument represented by Nāgasena ultimately has to undermine the intention behind the gift. There is, in the end, no actual loss for Vessantara, and this necessarily diminishes the extremity of his sacrifice. If the point of the *Vessantara-jātaka* is to demonstrate the lengths to which the Buddha was willing to go in his former lives to secure omniscience, then the *Milindapañha* has failed to reconcile these lengths with traditional Buddhist morality.

Contemporary readers of this tale have also been unnerved by its implications. Cone and Gombrich note in the introduction to their translation of the Pāli story: "The view that it is selfish to hand over one's family into slavery, or as a sign of, one's own spiritual advancement still remains, among Buddhists as well as among Western readers. In Ceylon we found Buddhist monks to opine that Vessantara had acted wrongly."[45] Clearly Viśvantara's gift was not to be imitated literally. Indeed, it is nearly impossible not to feel revulsion at the reckless abandonment of his family. And yet, this almost certainly must have been the intention of the author of this tale: to single out the bodhisattva's single-minded quest for omniscience, the accomplishment of which enabled him to do far more good for humankind than the relatively small evil necessitated by his overly zealous generosity. In that light the tale can be seen as a tragedy in the literary sense, as has been discussed at length recently by Steven Collins.[46] Collins, borrowing from Gellner's notion of the "offensiveness" of ideology, shows how the *Vessantara-jātaka* encodes a fundamentally unresolvable conflict of values: between detachment and renunciation, on the one hand, and filial/paternal affection and beneficent gov-

ernment, on the other. It was precisely this creative antagonism between what Collins has termed two modes of Dhamma—the ascetic-virtuoso values of absolute right and wrong, and the context-dependent ethics of reciprocity—that allowed a Buddhist audience to empathize with the characters of the narrative while neither adopting nor rejecting Vessantara's morally ambivalent choices.[47]

To resolve this tension, to assume Vessantara's path for oneself, was to adopt what must have appeared to many Buddhists as a radical soteriology. For a Mainstream audience, buddhahood was situated at insurmountable remove from ordinary human potential. But for the authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla,* contemporary bodhisattvas were called to emulate the extraordinary sacrifices of Vessantara by way of the ascetic life of a wilderness dweller, a calling I will explore in greater detail in Chapter 3.

The Gift of the Body

However extreme one may regard Viśvantara's gift, it is by no means the most radical known to former life narratives, including a number of those referred to in the *Rāṣṭrapāla.* One of the most prominent themes repeatedly cited among the *jātaka*s referred to in the *Rāṣṭrapāla* is *dehadāna,* the gift of the body. In these cases, the bodhisattva, intent upon giving every conceivable thing asked of him, offers his eyes, hands, head, or other parts, including sometimes his entire body, in response to the entreaty of some interlocutor. This motif in Buddhist narrative literature has recently been dealt with at great length by Reiko Ohnuma, and I am in many ways indebted to her work in my own discussion of several examples from this genre.[48] Here I will briefly summarize and discuss only a few examples of "gift of the body" narratives cited in the *Rāṣṭrapāla.* These will be adequate for understanding the general thrust of such stories in the larger agenda of the authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla.*

The *Sarvaṃdada-jātaka,* known to a variety of Buddhist sources and collections, is among the more famous tales of self-sacrifice.[49] This narrative describes the time when Śākyamuni was formerly a king named Sarvaṃdada ("All Giver"). Despite being well known for his generosity, a king from a nearby realm attacked him out of greed. Sarvaṃdada, mindful of both the dangerous follies of kingship and the benefits of renouncing life in the world, retired to the forest rather than resist his usurper: " 'When shall I abandon the household, unpleasant because it is crowded with hundreds of evil deeds, and live in the forest, pleasing because of the joy and bliss of tranquility?'—those deliberations of my mind, which existed over a long time, have fortunately come to fruition without delay, on meeting this king."[50] Sarvaṃdada felt great relief in the forest, released now from the burdens of kingship and surrounded by sylvan beauty. It is

worth noting the interlude at this point in the text that exalts in considerable detail the pleasures of the forest, with its lovely waterfalls, rows of trees, and singing birds, all of which inspire joy in the bodhisattva: "The mind of those tossed about by the wind of sensual pleasure in the prison of the household, which is bereft of calmness and the cause of constant anxiety, has no cause for pleasure, flustered as it is by wickedness; it [the mind] immediately obtains tranquility in the forest, where the agitations and troubles as well as the joys and pleasures of men have been quieted."[51] This portrait of an idyllic landscape in the hinterland contrasts sharply with the view of the wilderness as dangerous and foreboding, a contrast that will be addressed more directly in Chapter 3.

A brahmin, driven by poverty, journeys to Sarvaṃdada's kingdom, knowing that the king was renowned for his generosity. The brahmin encountered Sarvaṃdada in the forest en route to his kingdom, at which time Sarvaṃdada befriended the brahmin while informing him that the king he seeks has renounced the throne to perform austerities *(tapas)* in the forest. Seeing that the brahmin was distraught, Sarvaṃdada suggested in response that the brahmin take him as ransom to the usurping king, who longed to extinguish any threat to his rule. The brahmin accepts his plan, and the Bodhisattva (Sarvaṃdada) entered the city in bondage, striking awe in those who see him with his glorious features—features often used to describe the Buddha: "Seeing him, pure like gold, tall as Mt. Sumeru, bright with the best of marks *[lakṣaṇaratnacitram],* having the gait of an elephant in rut, wearing a piece of bark as his garment and having long, matted hair, the enemy king trembled on account of his own spinelessness."[52] The usurping king, overcome by the sight of the Bodhisattva, rebuked the brahmin for his evil deed and offered to return the kingdom to Sarvaṃdada. Sarvaṃdada accepted his offer, despite his strong inclination to continue his renunciant life: "Bodhisattvas are beings who are not seized by attachment to the pleasures of the senses, even in the household as in the forest. Like ascetics, they are inclined to dwell in the forest regions, living alone with a fondness for tranquility."[53] The enemy king submitted to Sarvaṃdada and, disciplined by the Bodhisattva's example, returned to his own former kingdom. The reanointed Sarvaṃdada then gave the evil-minded brahmin wealth beyond his desires.

As in the *Viśvantara-jātaka,* the Sarvaṃdada narrative also represents gifting as an expression of renunciation. In both cases the Bodhisattva offers something of comparatively little worth (his family or self) for something of infinitely greater value: progress toward enlightenment, expressed as an opportunity "to extract the essence from his worthless body."[54] He leaves behind his foul, polluted body, subject to decay and death, so as to obtain a glorified body "bright with the best of marks." Ohnuma argues that the physical body here serves as a template for spiritual qualities: *dehadāna* allows for the exchange of one for the

other, "resulting in a corresponding 'dharma-body' favored over the ordinary physical body."[55] She continues:

> By giving away his body, the bodhisattva denigrates physical existence as being completely worthless and expresses a wish for some form of immaterial, non-embodied existence. This existence may be spoken of in terms of "body," but the body imagined is wholly non-physical, and the emphasis is on getting rid of all the shortcomings of physical existence: "Body" is used metaphorically here to stand for "non-body."[56]

The *Rāṣṭrapāla* moves in a very different direction. It clearly wants to celebrate the glorified *physical* body of the Buddha, a body that contemporary bodhisattvas can also achieve if they undergo the practice of ascetic discipline, which substitutes for the Buddha's extreme self-sacrifice. Ohnuma herself is aware of the unsatisfactory nature of such a dichotomy between the "physical" and the "spiritual." Nevertheless, she has exaggerated, in my opinion, the dissonance in the rhetoric of the body here. The contrast is not between absence/transcendence and presence/immanence, but between ordinary embodiment—with all its imperfections—and superior embodiment, which overcomes the limitations of the flesh by means of the bodhisattva's long career of self-sacrifice. The corporeal and the ethereal are not opposed but exist along a continuum, with the Buddha at the far end.

The bodhisattva's gift of his body is most often no mere ransom of his person. In many stories it involves the outright sacrifice of a body part: his eyes, hands, flesh, head, or entire body. One of the better known of these tales is the story of King Śibi (Pāli Sivi). There are several variations on this narrative, some in which the bodhisattva makes a gift of his eyes, others where he donates flesh from his thigh, still others where he gives his head or entire body.[57] My paraphrase and partial translation here is drawn from the version in the *Xianyu jing* (Scripture on the Wise and the Foolish):[58]

> Countless aeons ago, the Buddha was a king named Śibi, who lived in a prosperous capital called Dīpavatī [*ti po ba ti* 提婆拔提]. King Śibi governed 84,000 small kingdoms in Jambudvīpa and possessed a huge retinue of wives, concubines, princes, and ministers, over whom he exercised great compassion.
>
> At that time Śakra, lord of the gods, declining in strength and life force, grew melancholic. The god Viśvakarman saw Śakra lamenting and inquired as to his malady. Śakra replied with a host of depressing observations: he was approaching death; the [presumably former] Buddha's

Dharma had disappeared; and there are no great bodhisattvas in the world in whom to take refuge. Viśvakarman reported that there is a great king in Jambudvīpa named Śibi who follows the bodhisattva path. "You should go and take refuge in him; he will certainly be able to save you."

Śakra retorted: "If he is a bodhisattva, first we should test him to see whether or not he is really sincere. You transform yourself into a pigeon; I will change into a falcon and will chase you, after which we will go to where the king is seated. Then you will seek his protection so as to test him. This will be sufficient to know if he is genuine or fake."

Viśvakarman transformed himself into a pigeon and Śakra changed into a falcon. After pursuing the pigeon, he was about to seize hold of it and eat it when the pigeon anxiously flew under the king's arm for refuge. The falcon perched itself in front of the palace and addressed the king: "Now this pigeon is my meal. Though he has come by the king's side, you should hasten to return him to me. My hunger is severe."

The king replied: "My former vow was to save all who come to me for refuge. I cannot, alas, give him to you."

The falcon retorted: "Great king, today you say that you will save all beings. If you cut me off from food, my life will not be saved. Are those like me not among 'all beings'?"

The king asked the falcon to accept another kind of meat—meat from the king's own thigh, which would not require him to sacrifice other lives.

The falcon was duly impressed by the king's generosity but remarked that, if he were to accept his flesh in exchange for the pigeon, he would have to receive a comparable portion of meat. The king ordered his attendants to bring in a scale. On one side he placed the pigeon; on the other, he placed the flesh cut from his thigh. Because this latter side was lighter than the pigeon, he cut additional flesh from his two arms and from both sides of his trunk. The flesh from his body still did not equal the pigeon in weight. Then the king lifted himself up, about to put his whole body on the scale pan when his strength failed and he fell to the ground unconscious. Coming to after a long time, he reproached himself: "I have long been fatigued transmigrating through the triple world, undergoing sorrow and hardship without merit. Today is the time to be zealously established in practice; it is not the time for sloth."

Emboldening himself, he got up on the scale, joyous as he realized the virtue in this. At that time heaven and earth quaked in six ways. The heavenly mansions all shook up to the gods of the Form Realm. At the same time the gods came down to the atmosphere, from where they watched the bodhisattva afflict his body with austerities, his mind pledged

to the great Dharma without regard for his own life. Every god shed tears like a torrential downpour, raining down celestial flowers in homage.

Then Śakra returned to his original form and went before the king, saying: "Today you carried out such a difficult-to-fulfill course. What do you seek? Do you seek to become a *cakravartin* king, a Śakra, or a Brahmā?[59] What do you seek within the triple world?

The bodhisattva replied: "What I seek cannot be met with among the pleasures esteemed in the triple world. The meritorious reward for what I have done is directed toward enlightenment."

Śakra then inquired if the bodhisattva had any regrets in so destroying his body. He replied that he did not. Śakra wondered aloud who could believe the king's assertion while looking at his trembling body. The king reiterated his vow: "From the beginning until today, I have been without any regret, even as large as a hair breadth. The vow that I have sought to fulfill will certainly succeed. If this is true, not false, as I say, may my body be restored."

Once he performed this Act of Truth, the king's body was immediately restored, even more excellent than before. Gods and men both exclaimed, "Extraordinary!" as they jumped for joy. King Śibi was none other than the Buddha himself.

"Blessed One, formerly you were without regard for body and life for the sake of sentient beings. . . . Why do you now abandon all sentient beings and enter *nirvāṇa*?" Then Brahmā appeared before the Blessed One and stated that the Buddha had offered his head a thousand times in the past for sentient beings as he sought the Dharma. At Brahmā's request, the Buddha proceeded to the Deer Park in Benares, where he turned the wheel of Dharma, thus manifesting the three jewels in the world to the delight of all.

In such cases of extreme giving, we are confronted with an unavoidable tension: to what extent is the bodhisattva, by his sacrifice, a model of the ideal donor, a benefactor who gives without regard to personal consequences, and to what extent may his acts be inimitable, a literary expression of cultic devotion that places the Buddha in a transcendent category?[60] As with gifts offered in other tales, the bodhisattva's sacrifice of his physical body stands in place of world renunciation, for his world has not yet a buddha nor the Dharma and therefore no institutional monasticism. For a contemporary Mainstream audience, Śākyamuni's dispensation presumably makes such extreme acts of giving no longer necessary, for a devout lay person now has available the supreme field of merit: the *saṅgha* headed by the Buddha. In a post-Śākyamuni world, the deeds of the bodhisattva are ideal only in the past.[61] Members of living bodhisattva traditions in the Mahāyāna, however, may well have taken these sacrifices more literally, as we will see below.

Restraining the Gift

A number of Buddhist sources are critical of such extreme forms of giving or at least felt the need to qualify them substantially. For example, after describing King Śibi's gift of his flesh to save the pigeon as the fulfillment of the perfection of generosity, the *Da zhidu lun* (Great Treatise on the Perfection of Wisdom) qualifies its previous statement from the point of view of the perfection of wisdom.[62] If giving mere material goods constitutes an inferior gift, giving one's body is still only a medium gift. The superior gift is achieved when one makes the donation with utter detachment. When asked why King Śibi's sacrifice represents a medium gift when it was previously said to express the fulfillment of the perfection of generosity, the commentator points out that King Śibi's thoughts were impure—he failed to perceive that neither he nor what he gave exists in any inherent way. Lacking wisdom, his thoughts are attached to false notions of donor, gift, and recipient. While such a gift entitles King Śibi to meritorious recompense in this world, it cannot lead directly to buddhahood.

I should note, however, that while such a critique of ordinary notions of giving is indeed common in some genres of Mahāyāna literature, the *Rāṣṭrapāla* itself offers no such qualification of giving vis-à-vis the perspective of *śūnyatā.* For the authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla,* the purity of the bodhisattva's intention appears to have been assumed: he gave without regret or limitation, feeling no distress as he strove to accomplish the spiritual perfections that would result in complete enlightenment.

Other Buddhist authors, however, were disconcerted by the disparity between the extremity of such a gift and the worthiness of the recipient. For example, Śāntideva, in his *Bodhicaryāvatāra,* declares:

> The body serves the True Dharma. One should not harm it for some inferior reason. For it is the only way that one can quickly fulfill the hopes of living beings.
>
> Therefore one should not relinquish one's life for someone whose disposition to compassion is not as pure. But for someone whose disposition is comparable, one should relinquish it. That way, there is no overall loss.[63]

There can be no doubt that Śāntideva was himself well aware of such gift of the body narratives, for he records several in his compilation the *Śikṣāsamuccaya.*[64] Śāntideva's view, then, is unexpected here, for over and over again, *dehadāna* stories portray the bodhisattva as making his sacrifice to a recipient who often is not only his spiritual inferior but may even harbor evil intentions for the gift.

There is an illustrative story in the *Da zhidu lun* concerning the great disciple Śāriputra's earlier attempt to fulfill the perfection of generosity.[65] Sixty aeons ago, while he formerly trod the bodhisattva path, Śāriputra was approached by a beggar who demanded his eye. Asked why he wanted the eye instead of his body or his personal property, the beggar replied: "I don't need your body or your goods; I only want your eye. If you really practice generosity, you will give it to me." Śāriputra took out one of his eyes and gave it to the beggar. The beggar took the eye, and in Śāriputra's presence, sniffed it and spit on it, then threw it to the ground and stepped on it. Śāriputra thought to himself how difficult it would be to save such a malicious person. Despite having no use for the eye, he requested it, and when it was given to him, he threw it to the ground and stepped on it. "Such people are impossible to save. Better to train oneself and more quickly escape from *saṃsāra*." Henceforth Śāriputra left the path of the bodhisattva and returned to the Lesser Vehicle.

The point here for this Mahāyāna commentator is that Śāriputra's failing—unlike those who remain zealously committed to the bodhisattva path—was to regret his gift on account of the recipient's lack of appreciation or worth. Generosity is only perfected when there is not the slightest reservation. Śāntideva's cost-benefit analysis, that one should not destroy one's life for someone of lesser spiritual qualities, seems by contrast designed to inhibit his potentially overzealous contemporaries from imitating the bodhisattva's heroic deeds too literally. Despite clear canonical precedent, it is not unlikely that such extreme acts of self-sacrifice were unsettling to a domesticated Mahāyāna establishment of Śāntideva's age (ca. seventh to eighth centuries). If the late-seventh-century Chinese pilgrim Yijing is to be believed, there may indeed have been grounds for this concern in medieval India at a time roughly contemporaneous with Śāntideva. Given the intrinsic interest of Yijing's account with regard to the gift of the body motif, I will provide here a complete translation of the two relevant chapters from his travelogue.[66]

Chapter 38: "Burning the Body Is Not Acceptable"

> For those within the assembly of renunciants, there is but one path. Those who are at the beginner level tend to be hard-core; they are not yet trained in the scriptural canon. They put their faith in their predecessors, using the burning of fingers as a way to make extreme efforts, and they regard the burning of the flesh as a great blessing. They do this solely in accordance with their own feelings, making judgments on the basis of their own thoughts. As is made clear in scripture, these activities belong to the realm of the laity. If they [the laity] are exhorted to offer even their own bodies, how much more the rest of their "external" wealth. Therefore [this prac-

tice] is only referred to in the scriptures if people have generated the aspiration for enlightenment. [The scriptures] do not make reference to the assembly of renunciants [participating in this practice]. The reason is that people who have left the household are restricted by the *vinaya-piṭaka.* If they are without violation in the precepts, only then do they have a proper understanding of scripture. If they have shortcomings with regard to the precepts, they do not yet understand what is permissible. Even if the grass around the monastery should be thick, surely [a monk] would not destroy a single blade. Even were you to be alone and hungry in a wide-open field, how could you eat even one-half a grain [not given you]?[67]

However, [the bodhisattva] Sarvasattvapriyadarśin, who was a layman, burned his arm as an offering—truly that was appropriate.[68] It was possible for the Bodhisattva to give away his male and female children.[69] So should we have monks seek children in order to give them away? The Mahāsattva destroyed his eyes, destroyed his body, but suppose that we required mendicants to use their bodies or their eyes to practice giving! King Ṛṣinanda [?] killed people, but how could this be the practice of one who adheres to the *vinaya*?[70] Maitrībala sacrificed his body, but this is not what a monastic disciple should do.[71]

I have recently heard that youngsters, valiantly aspiring for enlightenment, think that if they burn their bodies, they will achieve highest enlightenment. As a result, they follow one after another in this practice, flippantly throwing away their bodies. How difficult it is to acquire a human body over ten or even a hundred aeons! Although one may be born a thousand, even ten thousand times as a human being, one may be of slight intelligence, or may seldom hear of the seven factors conducive to enlightenment, or may fail to encounter the Three Jewels. Since now we have access to a human body and a most excellent situation in which to submit our minds to the marvelous Dharma, to throw away our measly flesh, having barely grasped a single verse of scripture, would be even more reckless. Having reflected upon impermanence for only a short time, how can they regard making such a trifling offering as significant? They should comply with and firmly observe the *prātimokṣa,* requite the four benevolences we receive,[72] and steadfastly engage in meditation in the hope of extracting themselves from the three realms of existence. Even a small fault should entail great apprehension, like traversing a deep ocean while guarding a floating pouch. In practicing wisdom, one must be steadfastly reserved, as when one spurs on a horse while treading on thin ice. Then, aided until the moment of our deaths by the strength of beneficent friends, we remain unafraid. Keeping in mind right mindfulness, we aspire to see Maitreya in the future.

If one aspires to only a small attainment, then the eight progressive stages toward sainthood *[āryapudgala]* can be sought. But if we train in the "Great Recourse" [i.e., the Mahāyāna], then the span of three incalculable aeons is but the beginning. To hastily cut off one's own life—truly I have yet to hear a reason for this. The sin of suicide is second only to [the violations of] the first section [i.e., the *pārājika* offenses]. When I examine the *vinaya-piṭaka,* I do not see any license for this practice. To reduce passions is the essential method of the [Buddha's] teaching. How can cutting off delusion be achieved through burning oneself? Castration was also not allowed by the Buddha, but he did exalt the releasing of fish back into a pond as meritorious.[73] To break such a serious precept and follow one's own intentions is to obstruct and disobey the word of the Buddha. To fix the mind on such a practice [as burning the body] is truly contrary to the teaching of the Noble One. There certainly are those who practice the bodhisattva training and do not accept the precepts and regulations. They disregard their own lives to save others. They are necessarily beyond our discussion here.

Chapter 39: "Bystanders Are Guilty Too"

Generally actions like burning the body aim in particular to display inner sincerity. Sometimes two or three people who are like-minded and on good terms with one another will entice beginners, knowingly leading them to their deaths. Those who end their lives first are guilty of a grave offense *[sthūlātyaya].* Those who subsequently bring their lives to an end incur a *pārājika* offense.[74] They cannot uphold the prohibitions while perpetuating their whims. If they steadfastly dedicate themselves to breaking the precepts by seeking death, they have never set their sights on the [Buddha's] doctrine.

If bystanders encourage this practice, this is no different than the cliché about "misplacing the [acupuncture] needle at its insertion point."[75] If one of them says, "Why not throw yourself into the fire?" he too incurs the fault like "breaking a stone [that cannot be reunited]."[76] Alas! In this matter one should be truly restrained. As the adage goes: "To kill oneself is not as good as requiting virtue; to destroy one's name is not as good as holding firm in the rules of decorum."

However, throwing one's body down before a hungry tigress is the salvific sacrifice of the Bodhisattva.[77] Cutting off one's flesh to take the place of a pigeon is not the proper behavior of a *śramaṇa.*[78] Therefore, the same norm is certainly not appropriate in his [i.e., the *śramaṇa*'s] case.

I have succinctly related what is acceptable and what is not in accor-

> dance with the *tripiṭaka.* As for what is appropriate behavior, the wise should consider this in detail.
>
> In the Ganges River, any number of people are killed daily [by self-drowning]. In the vicinity of the hill at [Bodh-]gāya, those who kill themselves are not few. Some don't eat, starving themselves. Others climb trees and throw themselves down. These behaviors are misguided. The Blessed One judged such actions to be heretical. Furthermore, there are some who castrate themselves—this is profoundly contrary to the *vinaya.* Even those who regard such action as wrong fear committing a violation themselves and so do not dare admonish others. But if one sacrifices one's life for this reason, then one mistakes the fundamental point of one's whole life. This is why the Buddha forbade it. With regard to the above-mentioned persons, the broadly learned do not themselves consent to this practice. What the virtuous of old have transmitted I will relate as follows.

The fact that Yijing was an eyewitness to contemporary practice in India makes his discussion of *dehadāna* particularly illuminating.[79] Yijing was clearly concerned that young, impressionable monks would be misled by their elders, some of whom apparently took the scriptural passages concerning the gift of the body literally. The *dehadāna* narratives frequently proclaim the body to be worthless, which affords the bodhisattva an opportunity to "extract the essence from his insubstantial body" by sacrificing it for others. Yijing by contrast emphasizes the rarity of a human rebirth. It would be foolish from his point of view for a monk to squander the opportunity to use his body for spiritual advancement.

In fact, Yijing is principally concerned with adherence to the *vinaya,* since it was the desire to acquire *vinaya* texts that motivated his journey to India from the start. He therefore is emphatic that those who have left the household must first and foremost submit to monastic law—and this most definitely prohibits suicide and encouraging others to destroy their flesh. But it is also interesting that Yijing admits that such extreme acts of giving would be appropriate for *lay* bodhisattvas, those individuals, as he says, "who practice the bodhisattva training and do not accept the precepts and regulations."

We see in these statements a profound ambivalence. Clearly Yijing is aware of the scriptural precedent for this form of self-sacrifice, a precedent that a number of monks in medieval India apparently took to heart. But at the same time he wants to declare that ordained recluses, regardless of their spiritual orientation, must adhere to a different norm. The hermeneutical principle is clear: if there is a perceived conflict between *sūtra* and *vinaya, vinaya* wins. Yijing is especially concerned with this practice among Chinese monks, who had long engaged in the custom of burning the flesh—particularly the fingers—as an act

of heroic devotion.[80] We are, in the end, left with the impression that the sacrifice of the body in pursuit of enlightenment was not perceived as a perverse oddity from an ancient era. It had remained, ironically, a living option for those on the fast track toward enlightenment, yet one that made representatives of the monastic establishment more than a little uncomfortable.

For the *Rāṣṭrapāla* the extreme sacrifice of the *dehadāna* stories represented a model of bodhisattva behavior not necessarily to be imitated literally but homologized in the sacrifices entailed by ascetic discipline. Immediately after finishing the list of references to the fifty previous life stories, the author of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* has the Buddha state:

> Formerly doing hundreds of such difficult to carry out acts, I felt no distress at that time while seeking the highest pure enlightenment.
>
> There is nothing internal or external that I have not given when I trained in morality, tolerance, heroic exertion, meditation, stratagems, and wisdom.
>
> I gave the flesh, skin, marrow, and blood from my very own body. When I was training in caves in the hinterlands, my body was drained.
>
> The vehicle of ascetic discipline taught by the Victors is the one in which they applied themselves and became the Victors. In that ascetic discipline I constantly exerted myself when I was steadfastly training in the past.[81]

The vehicle of ascetic discipline, manifested in the practice of the *dhutaguṇa*s, represented the proper sacrifice of the bodhisattva, the only means by which his goal of supreme, perfect enlightenment could be achieved as it was achieved by all buddhas. It is to this practice, then, that we will turn in the following chapter, since it represents the crux of the bodhisattva path for the *Rāṣṭrapāla*.

CHAPTER THREE

Wilderness Dwelling and the Ascetic Disciplines

> Membership in an expensive religion is, for many people, a "good bargain."
> —Rodney Stark, *The Rise of Christianity*

The Institutional Status of the Early Mahāyāna

It will be clear to readers already that I take the fundamental orientation of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* to be ascetic, expressed as a commitment to the practice of the "qualities of purification" (*dhutaguṇas*) within the context of a retreat to the wilderness. This chapter will attempt to flesh out this orientation in more detail, in relationship both to Mainstream Buddhist literature as well as to other voices within the Mahāyāna fold. Despite the significance of this asceticizing strand within a number of early Mahāyāna *sūtras*, other texts within this literature will sharply qualify, if not outright reject, wilderness dwelling as an appropriate course of action for the bodhisattva. We will look at two instances from the antiforest camp as well.

It may come as a surprise to some readers that there was an important ascetic "wing" within the bodhisattva vehicle at all. The vast majority of the textbooks on Buddhism, including some by well-respected specialists, have until relatively recently been almost unanimous in seeing the early Mahāyāna as a lay development, an anticlerical response to monastic elitism. This view had been so well entrenched that it appeared to reflect the consensus of European, American, and Japanese scholarship alike. Certainly representative of this position would be the statements by the great Belgian scholar Étienne Lamotte:

> Le Mahāyāna est traversé de part en part par un esprit laïc et démocratique. Les Mahāyāna *sūtra* ne s'adressent plus avant tout aux moines qui ont quitté leur maison pour mener une vie errante, mais aux nobles fils et filles de famille demeurés dans le siècle. Les cérémonies de sortie du

> monde *(pravrajya)* et d'ordination *(upasampadā)* en présence du Saṃgha des religieux sont conservées, mais il est loisible au bodhisattva, moine ou laïc, de s'engager par serment individuel sans aucune intervention cléri-que. Enfin, si les religieux ont leur place dans les rangs des mahāyānistes, ils ne sont nullement à l'abri de la critique, et nombre de Mahāyāna *sūtra,* comme les deux *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā,* ne sont autre chose que des pamphlets anti-cléricaux, où le clergé bouddhique est sévèrement pris à partie: "Dénués de pudeur et de moralité, impudents comme des corneilles, hautains, irascibles, dévorés de jalousie, d'orgueil, d'infatuation: voilà ce que seront les religieux de mon Église."[1]

Lamotte's view has sometimes been characterized as an attempt to see in the rise of the Mahāyāna a development akin to the Protestant Reformation, in effect, a "priesthood of all believers." Whether or not this is true, other scholars, particularly in Japan, have also seen a lay orientation in the early Mahāyāna that was not dependent upon a projection of European religious tensions into Indian history. Akira Hirakawa has been by far the most influential scholar in Japan to make such an argument, so much so that until very recently his position had been almost completely unchallenged in Japan. The fact that a number of his writings are available in English has also furthered his influence in the West. Central to his argument is the inclusion within Mahāyāna *sūtra* discourse of the figures of the *kulaputra* and *kuladuhitṛ,* often translated as "son or daughter of good family." These figures, often the recipients of sermons by the Buddha in Mahāyāna literature, are clearly nonmonastic and therefore, according to Hirakawa, representative of a new sociological orientation:

> As shown above the terms kulaputra and kuladuhitṛ did not develop in the Āgama to mean explicitly a Buddhist. . . . But these very terms were used by Mahāyāna writers to describe their followers. This means that the Mahāyāna adherents were composed of an entirely different group of people from the Nikāya Buddhists. . . . Yet the point is that the new Saṃgha utilized the terms, bodhisattva and kulaputra, which had never been fully developed in the Āgama, suggesting that a different historical development took place besides the orthodox Saṃgha. The characteristic of such terms as bodhisattva and kulaputra is that they make no distinction between the lay and priesthood which is also one of the significant features of Mahāyāna Buddhism.[2]

Hirakawa further argued that these first lay bodhisattvas organized themselves at *stūpa*s, which he took to be outside of the institutional control of the Bud-

dhist clergy, and only later did the movement develop monastic orders parallel to the Mainstream. Part of his argument was based on a questionable reading of several technical terms for *stūpa* and monastery in early Chinese translations of Mahāyāna texts.[3] Hirakawa has since reiterated his position in multiple publications over the last four decades.[4]

Terminological issues aside, the more fundamental question vis-à-vis the locus of the early Mahāyāna is whether our textual sources actually indicate a central place for the *stūpa* cult under the management of lay bodhisattvas. Gregory Schopen readdressed this argument in what has become one of the most influential pieces on the sociology of the early Mahāyāna.[5] What Schopen discerned from a close reading of a wide range of sources is that many Mahāyāna *sūtra*s indicate considerable ambivalence—if not outright hostility—toward the cult of the *stūpa.* The Mainstream orders, contrary to Hirakawa's assumption, maintained an almost complete monopoly on the management of the *stūpa* cult, as strongly suggested in the archeological record by their placement in or near established monasteries. For this reason, early Mahāyāna fraternities appear to have opted for alternative cultic centers, namely, the site where their sacred texts were established or preached. Bodhisattva groups buttressed this cult of the book by rhetorically connecting their texts with the Buddha's own enlightenment experience, thereby attempting to co-opt the cultic potency of the well-established pilgrimage site at Bodh-gayā where the Buddha himself achieved enlightenment. Thus, Schopen argues, early Mahāyāna groups did not locate themselves around *stūpa*s, which they almost certainly would have been unable to control, but around their written scriptures and/or the preachers who recited them.[6]

Institutionally speaking, however, the cult of the book is neutral with regard to the ordination status of individual bodhisattvas. It is conceivable that the book cult could have been located either within or outside of a monastic setting. Thus it will be necessary to provide additional evidence from within Mahāyāna literature of its fundamentally monastic and, I will argue, ascetic orientation, at least as represented by a significant strand of its textual tradition.

Perhaps the clearest expression of this hypothesis is found in a recent article by Paul Harrison, "Searching for the Origins of the Mahāyāna: What Are We Looking For?" On the basis of his reading of the corpus of Mahāyāna texts rendered into Chinese by the second-century translator Lokakṣema, Harrison proposed:

> Far from being the products of an urban, lay, devotional movement, many Mahāyāna *sūtra*s give evidence of a hard-core ascetic attempt to return to the original inspiration of Buddhism, the search for Buddhahood or awakened cognition. . . . They also display a strong and positive emphasis on

> the *dhuta-guṇas* (extra ascetic practices) and *araṇya-vāsa* (dwelling in the forest or jungle), which is surely rather strange in the documents of a supposedly lay-dominated movement.[7]

The *Rāṣṭrapāla* substantially confirms Harrison's characterization, providing one of the most trenchant arguments in Mahāyāna literature for the centrality of the ascetic disciplines and a return to the wilderness for those engaged in the bodhisattva career. However, it is appropriate to discuss the practice of the *dhutaguṇas* in the context of early Buddhist literature before proceeding to evidence presented by the *Rāṣṭrapāla* and other Mahāyāna *sūtra*s.

The *Dhutaguṇa*s in Mainstream Literature

The *dhutaguṇa*s, literally "qualities of purification," are the traditional set of ascetic disciplines in both Mainstream and Mahāyāna literature that came to characterize, or rather standardize, the rigorous life of the forest-dwelling monk. They are variously listed as twelve or thirteen, although some texts further reduce or expand the list.[8] Despite such variations, there is considerable overlap in the various formulations. One of the standard thirteen member lists is as follows:

1. *piṇḍapātika:* one who subsists only on alms and relinquishes accepting invitations to eat in lay households
2. *sāvadānapiṇḍapātika:* one who goes on alms rounds systematically, without showing preference for some houses over others
3. *ekāsanika:* one who eats in one sitting only
4. *khalupaścādbhaktika:* one who does not eat after the appropriate time (i.e., midday)
5. *traicīvarika:* one who wears only the three monastic robes
6. *nāmatika:* one who wears a woolen garment
7. *pāṃsukūlika:* one who wears refuse-rag robes, that is, does not accept donations of cloth from patrons
8. *āraṇyaka:* one who dwells in the wilderness
9. *vṛkṣamūlika:* one who lives at the foot of a tree
10. *ābhyavakāśika:* one who dwells in the open air, that is, without roof or cover
11. *śmāśānika:* one who dwells in cremation grounds
12. *naiṣadika (naiṣadyika):* one who remains in the sitting posture without lying down
13. *yathāsaṃstarika:* one who accepts whatever seat is offered[9]

Pāli sources usually include *pattapiṇḍika*, "one who eats only a single bowl of food,"[10] in place of *nāmatika*. Although the thirteen-member list tends to appear only in relatively late Pāli literature, a number of the items show up throughout the canon and in other Mainstream texts.[11] The *Shier toutuo jing* 十二頭陀經 (Sūtra on the Twelve Dhutaguṇas), a Mahāyāna-affiliated text translated into Chinese in the early sixth century, omits both *nāmatika* and *yathāsaṃstarika* but includes "measured eating" instead.[12]

In his detailed discussion of the forest orientation across Buddhist traditions, Reginald Ray argues that texts like the *Vimuttimagga* (Skt. *Vimuktimārga*) "provide us with a glimpse of life in the forest," constituting "a description of thirteen *dhutaguṇa*s, much as they must have been practiced by forest renunciants."[13] There is a danger, however, in conflating normative textual expressions with actual practice. In fact, their very standardization within the literature into twelve- or thirteen-item lists may suggest an attempt to domesticate a potentially subversive movement, to contain the threat such practices represented to the sedentary monastic establishment. Such a threat could be neutralized by co-option—adopting but weakening the ascetic impulse—or by restriction, a tightening of the ranks of those who qualify for such strictures.

Buddhaghosa's *Visuddhimagga* may be an example of the former strategy. After listing and describing the thirteen classic *dhutaṅga*s ("limbs of purification") in chapter 2 of his classic fifth-century compendium, Buddhaghosa notes that there are three degrees of conformity to the actual practice: those who are strict in their observance of the discipline; those who are mediocre in adherence; and those whose commitment is "mild."[14] For example, Buddhaghosa describes the manifold ways that one who observes the practice of wearing only refuse-rag robes might obtain materials with which to make his garment. Such a monk could obtain them from cremation grounds, from the street, or from a piece that has been gnawed by animals, but he may not accept cloth as a personal gift from a householder. Nevertheless, Buddhaghosa observes, there are gradations of adherence:

> The *grades* are these. There are three kinds of refuse-rag wearers: the strict, the medium, and the mild. Herein, one who takes it only from a charnel ground is strict. One who takes one left [by someone, thinking], 'One gone forth will take it' is medium. One who takes one given by being placed at his feet [by a bhikkhu] is mild.[15]

In other words, Buddhaghosa allows that an ascetic practitioner remains faithful to his discipline even though he accepts a gift of robes from a fellow monk. While Ray wants to see in Buddhaghosa's casuistry the culmination of a long process of monasticization of the forest tradition, I am more inclined to see

here an instance of intramonastic tension. Buddhaghosa's solution allows him to maintain a normative place for settled monasticism while at the same time both recognizing and domesticating this more radical threat to its authority. I will return to this issue in Chapter 4.

In the *Milindapañha* we see a similar praise of the ascetic disciplines. The monastic protagonist Nāgasena goes so far as to say that anyone, including a layman, who has achieved *nibbāna* has done so by the practice of the *dhutaguṇa*s in former lives.[16] But Nāgasena also reminds King Milinda that there are individuals who are not worthy to undertake these special vows:

> Furthermore, whichever person, Great King, who undertakes the ascetic disciplines *[dhutaṅgaṃ]* but has evil desires, is overcome with covetousness, is hypocritical, greedy, gluttonous, desirous of profit, desirous of fame, desirous of renown, undisciplined, unaccomplished, unsuitable, unworthy, unbefitting [of the *saṅgha*], he incurs a double punishment and incurs the destruction of all virtues.[17]

Nāgasena goes on to say that such an individual will be ridiculed by and expelled from the monastic community in this life and will suffer torments in the Avīci Hell in the next.

Again, Ray, consistent with his thesis on the estrangement of forest dwellers from sedentary monastics, sees in such statements an attempt to restrict the *dhutaguṇa*s to monks in good standing with the establishment:

> Like the *Parivāra,* then, the *Milindapañha* says that only monastics, and among these only those deemed worthy, are permitted to practice the *dhutaguṇa*s without incurring negative consequences. For the *Milindapañha,* only a select few have the right to practice them, and the text explicitly mentions only virtuous members of the monastic order as qualified. It seems, moreover, that they may retire to the forest only when their obligations to the monastic order are fully in order (that is, they remain in good standing). . . . It may be noted how easily this restriction can provide a basis for the repudiation of Buddhist renunciants following the *dhutaguṇa*s who may not be *prātimokṣa*-following *bhikṣu*s at all or who are otherwise deemed unfit according to canons of settled monasticism.[18]

Unfortunately, Ray has, in my opinion, conflated two separate issues. It is almost certain that wilderness dwellers were always members of established monastic orders, and as monks, they would have been expected to fulfill a number of the obligations incumbent on Buddhist renunciants generally. Certainly the *Rāṣṭrapāla*

assumes as much, as we shall see shortly, and so do many other texts, Mainstream and Mahāyāna alike. In fact, the restrictions pressed for by the *Milindapañha* make little sense unless one assumes an ongoing relationship between different but connected monastic orientations. Rather than representing an attempt to repudiate forest dwelling per se, the *Milindapañha* may be more concerned with reining in irregular practitioners: those who are motivated by base concerns—a topic the *Rāṣṭrapāla*'s authors will harp on endlessly—as well as, perhaps, forest monks whose relationship with the *saṅgha* had become more distant than its senior members were comfortable with. In other words, I see no evidence for a premonastic or nonmonastic *dhutaguṇa* tradition in Buddhist literature as assumed by Ray. The practice of these additional ascetic disciplines is in my view a reformist movement within Mainstream Buddhism, one that was co-opted also in some Mahāyāna circles and continues to this day among Theravādin monastics.[19] Again, we will return to this issue at some length in Chapter 4.

However, there have been attempts to mandate the rigorous discipline of the *dhutaguṇa*s more generally and monastic authors have on occasion felt compelled to qualify their validity. One of the clearest markers of this tension in Mainstream sources is that a number of the ascetic practices are associated with Devadatta, the cousin and notorious rival of the Buddha, whose views came to be characterized by most of the early schools as heretical. The legends surrounding Devadatta have been treated in considerable detail already, so it will suffice merely to summarize the main features.[20]

The Devadatta Cycle

While meditating privately one day, it occurred to Devadatta that he should seek out a patron so as to receive the homage he thought was his due. To this end he approached the young prince Ajātasattu with a display of his supernormal powers. Duly impressed, Ajātasattu heaped offerings upon him day and night. So enamored was he with his newly elevated status, Devadatta came to believe that he should take over the leadership of the *saṅgha*. He approached the Buddha then with a proposition: given that the Blessed One was getting on in years, perhaps it would be best if he turned the leadership of the monastic order over to Devadatta. The Buddha rejected the request harshly, and this perceived slight by the Buddha marks the beginning of Devadatta's malice toward the Buddha. The Buddha then ordered the monks to issue a formal act of proclamation (*pakāsaniyakamma*) against Devadatta, convincing even Sāriputta to speak against Devadatta, despite his having formerly praised him.

Next Devadatta conspires with prince Ajātasattu, inciting him to murder his father as Devadatta plots to murder the Buddha. Ajātasattu's attempt is

thwarted, but his father, King Bimbisāra, hands over the kingdom to the young Ajātasattu nonetheless. Emboldened by his patron's new position, Devadatta makes a series of attempts on the Buddha's life. All of his attempts fail, although in at least one case the Buddha is reported to have been injured.[21] Unable to dislodge the Buddha from the head of the *saṅgha,* Devadatta next plots discord among the monks by proposing that the Buddha mandate five austere disciplines for all recluses. These five are as follows:

1. forest dwelling
2. alms begging
3. the wearing of only refuse-rag robes
4. living at the foot of a tree
5. not eating meat or fish

All of these disciplines, Devadatta suggests, should be followed "for as long as life lasts." The Buddha's response is again sharp:

> Enough, Devadatta. . . . Whoever wishes, let him be a forest-dweller; whoever wishes, let him stay in the neighbourhood of a village; whoever wishes, let him be a beggar for alms; whoever wishes, let him accept an invitation; whoever wishes, let him be a rag-robe wearer; whoever wishes, let him accept a householder's robes. For eight months, Devadatta, lodging at the root of a tree is permitted by me. Fish and flesh are pure in respect of three points: if they are not seen, heard or suspected (to have been killed on purpose for him).[22]

This is exactly the response Devadatta anticipates, for his mandated austerities were not, according to the Pāli *vinaya,* an earnest proposition. They were rather an attempt to expose the Buddha and his followers as lax to the laity, who, it could be expected, would be more inclined to support and patronize rigorist monks under Devadatta's rule. The *vinaya* authors, in fact, confirm this: those who were of little faith and poor intelligence were swayed by Devadatta's ploy, whereas those of deep faith and keen wisdom were disgusted by his efforts to divide the monastic order. The Buddha again warns Devadatta of the perilous consequences of fomenting schism in the order of monks. Devadatta fails to heed this warning and leads five hundred newly ordained monks to vote on his proposition. The Buddha sends Sāriputta and Moggallāna to retrieve these wayward monks, whom they convince to rejoin the order after hearing the two elders preach a sermon on Dharma. For his part, Devadatta is condemned to spend aeons in hell.

Although the legend of Devadatta differs considerably in the various *vi-*

naya traditions, Bareau concludes that the one element on which the *vinaya* all agree—to the extent, at least, that they contain this narrative cycle at all—is the recognition of Devadatta as a schismatic who argued for a rigorist interpretation of monastic discipline.[23] Devadatta became increasingly vilified, especially among the monastic lineages descended from the Sthavira wing (viz., Theravāda, Mahīśāsaka, Dharmaguptaka, and Sarvāstivāda), as his rigorist position conflicted more and more with an increasingly sedentary monasticism. Thus it became crucial to characterize Devadatta's motives in mandating the *dhutaguṇa* practice as schismatic, as designed not to purify the *saṅgha* but to divide it. Ray, then, is almost certainly correct in claiming that "the core of the Devadatta legend, and particularly the vitriolic nature of the condemnation of this saint, is best understood as the expression of a controversy between a proponent (and his tradition) of forest Buddhism and proponents of settled monasticism, a controversy that in the sources is seen from the viewpoint of the monastic side."[24]

The reports of Chinese pilgrims to north India indicate that the controversy between followers of Devadatta and the orthodox establishment was not settled in hoary antiquity. Faxian, who traveled to India in the early fifth century, notes that near the famous Jetavana monastery at Śrāvastī, "Devadatta also has a multitude of followers still there who always pay homage to the three previous buddhas but not to Śākyamuni Buddha."[25] It is interesting that these "Buddhist" monks were quite familiar with the literary tension between Śākyamuni and Devadatta so that their cult practice explicitly excluded adoration of Śākyamuni. Two centuries later, Xuanzang was also aware of an ongoing Devadatta tradition. In addition to mentioning a number of the episodes of the Devadatta legend commemorated at recognized sites, Xuanzang records the fact that three monasteries in the country of Karṇasuvarṇa (modern Bengal) did not take milk curd as food in accordance with the teachings of Devadatta.[26]

Although the late-seventh-century pilgrim Yijing does not mention the followers of Devadatta in his travel record, he does refer to them extensively in a commentarial note to his translation of a *karmavācanā* text from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya.*[27] In explicating the terms *suidang* 隨黨 (followers) and *fei suidang* 非隨黨 (nonfollowers) from the *vinaya,* he identifies the former with the Devadatta faction and the latter with the orthodox disciples of the Buddha. The followers of Devadatta, Yijing goes on to tell us, were spread throughout the Western regions and were particularly numerous at Nālandā. Their rules and doctrines are largely in accord with the orthodox tradition, though many of their monks apparently adhered to additional restrictions (e.g., not eating fermented dairy, as reported by Xuanzang). Interestingly, Yijing notes that when asked directly, some purported followers denied affiliation with a Devadatta faction, presumably because they feared reproach.

I am not convinced that these references provide testimony to the historical validity of the *vinaya* accounts concerning Devadatta and his relationship with the Mainstream orders, as Bareau and Ray want to suggest.[28] Neither Faxian nor Xuanzang understands these monastic followers of Devadatta as specifically advocating a return to the wilderness, even if it is likely that these monks saw themselves as perpetuating a more disciplined lifestyle. Moreover, Yijing does clearly indicate that, at Nālandā at least, such monks were integrated into the general monastic population—placing the very existence of a separate Devadatta *saṅgha* in doubt. It is entirely possible, if not likely, that these followers of Devadatta were part of a reinvented tradition, reacting to a local monastic controversy that may have paralleled the friction of the canonical account. Here I am reminded of an apt comment by Michael Carrithers: "In this broader perspective, asceticism and reform are merely an idiom through which dissent and segmentation are expressed in the *saṅgha*."[29] At the very least these eyewitness accounts confirm that the controversy between Devadatta and the monastic establishment was a living problem and not a mere literary artifact. And we will see additional evidence below that confirms similar ongoing tensions between wilderness dwelling and sedentary forms of monasticism.

Asceticism in the *Rāṣṭrapāla*

There can be no doubt that living in the wilderness in order to practice a rigorous form of reclusion was central to the orientation of the *Rāṣṭrapāla.* Over and over again the authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* exhort those on the bodhisattva path to "take pleasure in the wilderness" and "dwell alone like a rhinoceros" (13.5–7), to "not abandon residence in the wilderness" (13.17), to take "pleasure in lodging in secluded hinterlands" (14.14–15), to "always dwell in forests and caves" (15.1), and to "frequent the wilderness and manifold hinterlands" (16.3). Specific *dhutaguṇa* practices are listed in the story of Puṇyaraśmi's going forth after the death of the Buddha: "Having gone forth [from the household], he became a wearer of the three robes; he always practiced begging for alms, and he only sat [never lying down]" (57.10–11). When the Buddha describes the sacrifices he made lifetime after lifetime in pursuit of enlightenment, the *dhutaguṇa*s are clearly placed center stage: "The vehicle of ascetic discipline taught by the Victors is the one in which they applied themselves and became the Victors.[30] In that ascetic discipline I constantly exerted myself when I was steadfastly training in the past."[31] Here the vehicle of ascetic discipline *(dhutayāna)* is identified with the vehicle of the bodhisattva. All buddhas who have come before have followed this discipline, and all who hope to achieve complete and perfect enlightenment in the future will have to as well. In addition, the authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* assumed that bodhisattvas who engaged in such rigorous dis-

cipline would not be welcome at established monasteries near towns and villages and would as a result have to resort to the forest:

> Even when they are reviled on all sides, these sons of mine, remembering my words now during the final period [of the Dharma], will dwell in forests in the hinterland at that time.[32]

> Those who are disciplined in morality and virtue will be despised in the last period [of the Dharma]. Abandoning villages, kingdoms, and cities, they will dwell in the wilderness and forest.[33]

World renunciation is most centrally defined by sexual abstinence. Thus, one of the common traits of the ascetic orientation within Buddhist texts, indeed for ascetic factions in a great many religious traditions, is a disdain for women as temptresses who threaten the chastity of male recluses. Here again, the *Rāṣṭrapāla* is no exception. In a long discussion in "The Story of Puṇyaraśmi" between King Arciṣmat and the young prince Puṇyaraśmi, whom we learn later is a former incarnation of Śākyamuni Buddha, Puṇyaraśmi rejects his father's attempts to shower him with every possible sensual pleasure:

> Your majesty, no one has done anything unpleasant to me; but I have no desire today for sensual pleasures. All that are dear are like enemies, unfit for attachment, which cause one to fall into the abyss of defilements and unfortunate destinies.

> These women are pleasing to ignorant, stupid people. They are great pitfalls, bound by the noose of Māra. They are always so condemned by the [spiritually] ennobled *[āryajana].* How can I cherish those who are the source of affliction in the hells and unfortunate destinies?

> These women are beautiful and pleasing only on the surface. On account of its impurities, I have no interest in this contraption of sinews and bones. Oozing of excretions—blood, urine, and excrement—how can I delight in what are surely only suitable for a cemetery?[34]

Such misogynist passages have increasingly made it difficult to affirm the inclusive spirit of the early Mahāyāna in contradistinction to the monastic elitism so often ascribed to Mainstream authors. For example, the following remarks by Nancy Schuster are typical:

> There are many Mahāyāna Buddhist *sūtras* which have something to say about women. Some are quite hostile; many of these uphold the old clerical biases against women which have cropped up from time to time in the various Buddhist sects. . . . But there are many Mahāyāna scriptures which insist that only the ignorant make distinctions between the religious aspirations and intellectual and spiritual capacities of men and women. This position is the only one which is consistent with the Mahāyāna doctrine of the emptiness of all phenomena.[35]

Alan Sponberg has offered, in my view, a more nuanced appreciation of the multiplicity of voices operating in Buddhist literature with regard to the status of women.[36] He sees essentially four major attitudes expressed: beginning with soteriological inclusiveness (*nirvāṇa*/arhatship available to all), a somewhat later institutional androcentrism developed that privileged male authority, and this view coexisted with a more negative ascetic misogyny that projected the psychological distress of celibacy upon women, now seen as objectified desire. Lastly, a soteriological androgyny developed in the much later Vajrayāna tradition that positively revalorized the feminine in dramatic fashion. Sponberg summarizes his view of the development of misogynous attitudes thus:

> The most blatantly misogynous texts of the Pali literature are found in the *jātaka* stories, an (originally) noncanonical Buddhist appropriation of popular animal tales and hero legends. This relative (even if not exclusive) contrast between views in the *sutta* literature versus those in the more popular genres further supports my thesis that misogyny initially was resisted by the early tradition, but eventually found more of a home among those later factions of the community who defined their soteriological goals more in terms of ascetic purification than in terms of psychological enlightenment.[37]

On the one hand, Sponberg's thesis is confirmed by what we see in the *Rāṣṭrapāla*, which not only defined its goals in terms of ascetic discipline, but drew upon a wealth of *jātaka* stories to lend support for these goals. However, I think it would be overstating the case to see these different attitudes in terms of temporal development. Sponberg's advocacy for a multiplicity of voices almost certainly applies to Buddhist literature of all periods. Clearly some very early texts express a sharply misogynous message. Consider, for example, this passage from the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, put in the mouth of the Buddha:

> Looking upon Craving, Aversion, and Passion [i.e., the daughters of Māra],

> I have not the least desire for sexual intercourse. What is this thing, full of urine and feces? I would not wish to touch it even with my foot.[38]

These sentiments, as we have just seen, are echoed in the *Rāṣṭrapāla.* I would also take issue with Sponberg's view that virulent misogyny only appears in *later* Mahāyāna literature as it developed its own ascetic wing within the *saṅgha:* "Although the early Mahāyāna reaffirmed the basic principle of soteriological inclusiveness with its universalization of the bodhisattva path, a religious ideal it held open to all—men and women, monastic and lay—this rejection of institutional androcentrism did not entail a corresponding rejection of ascetic misogyny."[39] We will see very little evidence in the *Rāṣṭrapāla*—or in other early Mahāyāna texts we will consider—for the kind of soteriological inclusiveness Sponberg and others so often refer to.[40] On the contrary, we will see a sharp narrowing of bodhisattva membership in favor of a highly selective, wilderness-dwelling fraternity of monks who had little room for women or the laity.[41]

Wilderness Dwelling and the *Dhutaguṇa*s in Other Mahāyāna Texts

Distinct echoes of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* and its predilection for wilderness asceticism can be found in a number of Mahāyāna *sūtra*s, with, as one might expect, varying degrees of enthusiasm. Few are more fervid, however, than the *Ratnarāśi,* a text made more readily accessible recently by Jonathan Silk's superb edition, translation, and study.[42] From the very start, its authors make clear their bias in favor of the *śramaṇa,* who "follows the yogic practice of cultivating the path," "who delights in dwelling in the wilderness," "who abides in the *dhutaguṇa*s," and "who wanders alone like a rhinoceros."[43] The true monk—and there can be no doubt again that such an individual is part of a monastic community[44]—is described as "alone, unaccompanied, with nothing on which to rely, without possessions, without chattels" (*RR* V.6). He is entreated to take his alms systematically, in conformity with standard *dhutaguṇa* practice, showing no preference for generous patrons or disfavor toward those who give nothing (*RR* V.11). Although he practices alms begging, he should refrain from being intimate with specific patrons or dropping hints as to what he might prefer in his bowl (*RR* VI.10–11). Moreover, the ideal monk is one who is content to acquire his robes from the refuse heap, taking no delight in adorning his body with new clothing (*RR* VII.1).

Closely related to the *Ratnarāśi* is the *Kāśyapa-parivarta,* a text also within the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection of the Chinese and Tibetan canons.[45] The *Kāśyapa-parivarta* overlaps with the *Ratnarāśi* along a number of thematic lines, but it also exhibits considerably more polemic in its overtly pro-Mahāyāna

and anti-Hīnayāna stance. Nevertheless, it too is clearly in the proforest camp. The *Kāśyapa-parivarta* assumes that a true bodhisattva "will delight in the wilderness without wantonness" (*KP* §17) or "without deceit" (*KP* §19); "he dwells in the forest with great enthusiasm" (*KP* §25).[46] This *sūtra* is particularly sensitive to duplicity, charging that all too many renunciants engage in seemingly disciplined behavior—including the rigorous practices of the *dhutaguṇas*—only to elicit the admiration of others.[47] In Chapter 4 I will treat such charges against one's fellow renunciants in greater detail.

If the *Ratnarāśi* and the *Kāśyapa-parivarta,* along with the *Rāṣṭrapāla,* can safely be placed within the subgenre of texts espousing wilderness dwelling for the monastic bodhisattva, then we might be somewhat surprised to discover that another text ostensibly dedicated to the house-dwelling bodhisattva, the *Ugraparipṛcchā,* also belongs within this corpus.[48] The first two-thirds of the text describe at length the practices of the lay bodhisattva,[49] only to provide repeated opportunities to expose the faults of household life and the desirability of leaving it behind. Having soundly deconstructed the house-dwelling option as a viable path toward buddhahood, the author delivers his coup de grâce:

> There has never been a bodhisattva who dwells in the household and who has awakened to unexcelled, perfect enlightenment. They all, moreover, having gone forth from the household, fixed their thoughts on the wilderness with a predilection toward the wilderness. Having gone to the wilderness, they awakened to unexcelled, perfect enlightenment. And [it is there that] they acquired the prerequisites [Skt. *saṃbhāra*] [for enlightenment; i.e., merit and gnosis].[50]

This passage unequivocally makes renunciation of the household a necessity for the bodhisattva intent upon eventual enlightenment.[51] Clearly the goal of the *Ugraparipṛcchā* is not only to "asceticize the laity,"[52] but also to argue for the ultimate incompatibility of the spiritual orientation of the Mahāyāna with life in the household, a life that places far too many demands on one who is setting out for a goal as ambitious as complete buddhahood. In fact, mere renunciation is not enough. The lay bodhisattva must leave behind not only the comforts of the household, but, having gone forth as a *bhikṣu,* he must also relinquish the sedentary habits of the monastery. Here we see clear parallels with the wilderness orientation that we find loudly proclaimed in the *Rāṣṭrapāla:*

> I should examine the matter as follows: "I came to the wilderness on account of being afraid of such frightening and terrifying things [as inauspicious rebirths, and so forth, as mentioned in a previous passage]. I cannot

> be freed from such frightening and terrifying things as these by living in the household, by living in company [with others], or by living without exerting myself, without applying myself diligently to yoga, or by thinking distractedly. All bodhisattvas *mahāsattva*s who appeared in the past were delivered from every fear by dwelling in the wilderness; in this way they obtained the fearlessness that is unexcelled, perfect enlightenment. All bodhisattvas *mahāsattva*s who will appear in the future will be delivered from every fear by dwelling in the wilderness; in this way they will obtain the fearlessness that is unexcelled, perfect enlightenment. All bodhisattvas *mahāsattva*s who appear in the present and who have obtained unexcelled, perfect enlightenment are delivered from every fear by dwelling in the wilderness; in this way they obtained the fearlessness that is unexcelled, perfect enlightenment. Therefore, I too, frightened and terrified here, and desiring to transcend every fear and attain the fearless state, should dwell in the wilderness."[53]

Not surprisingly, overcoming fear is a recurring motif in this subgenre of texts.[54] We in the modern West have often come to regard the forest as a place of retreat from the hustle and bustle of urban life. It is for most of us an idyllic site, characterized by its capacity to refresh. But in the ancient world, the wilderness virtually defined the demonic. Peter Brown, the font of so much of what we know of asceticism in late antique Christianity, captures the spirit of this departure from civilization as well as any:

> However little we may know of the origin of the ascetic movement, we know a lot about the function and meaning of the monk's act of "displacement" in fourth- and fifth-century society. The holy man was thought to have gained freedom and a mysterious power, through having passed through the many visible boundaries of a society, that was not so much oppressed, as stubbornly organized for survival. In villages dedicated for millennia to holding their own against nature, the holy man had deliberately chosen "anti-culture"—the neighbouring desert, the mountain crags. . . . Above all, in a world where the human race was thought of as besieged by invisible demonic powers, the monks earned their reputation through being "prize-fighters" against the devil.[55]

In Buddhist literature, the wilderness is regularly cited as a place of manifold dangers, including robbers, wild animals, demons, drought, and famine.[56] This same preoccupation with fear of the wild—in the form of both animals and of ghosts—is borne witness in the personal accounts of forest monks in modern Thailand, whose stories bring the unsettling nature of the jungle vividly to life.[57]

These two passages from the *Ugraparipṛcchā* mark wilderness dwelling as a necessary, even if frightening, requisite for those who set out for buddhahood.[58] Both of these passages—and many others that could be marshaled—make it impossible to see the *Ugraparipṛcchā* as a blueprint for a lay bodhisattva ethic.[59]

There are a sizable number of additional passages in Mahāyāna *sūtra* literature, especially in the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection, that advocate the practice of the *dhutaguṇa*s in the context of forest reclusion. The fact that many of these texts are not well known, even among scholars in this field, has contributed to the near invisibility of this thrust within the early Mahāyāna until quite recently. A good example of such a little-known text would be the **Viśuddhaśraddhādārikā-paripṛcchā-sūtra* (Chin. *jingxin tongnü hui* 淨信童女會), which has not, to my knowledge, been translated yet into any Western language. It is one of a significant body of texts in which the principal protagonist is a young girl so advanced along the path that she engages famous bodhisattvas in virtuoso displays of wisdom, often to their embarrassment. Like Ugra, she too is situated in the household and not in the monastery. In this text the young girl Viśuddhaśraddhā has asked the Buddha a series of questions about the bodhisattva career, and the Buddha responds with an eightfold characterization of each point. One of these questions concerns the practice of the *dhutaguṇa*s:

> Furthermore, young girl, there are eight things by which a bodhisattva accomplishes the ascetic disciplines *[dhutaguṇa]* and always takes pleasure dwelling in the wilderness. What are the eight? (1) Having few desires; (2) Knowing satisfaction; (3) Fulfillment of the True Dharma; (4) Supporting oneself with what is meritorious; (5) Always upholding the four traditions of the spiritually ennobled *[āryavaṃsa];* (6) Seeing the misery of *saṃsāra,* his mind is always disgusted and aloof; (7) He constantly observes [things as] impermanent, suffering, empty, and without self; (8) Having a deep faith that is unshakable, he does not fall into heterodox teachings.
>
> At that time the Blessed One again spoke these verses:
>
>> Having few desires and knowing satisfaction, [the bodhisattva] does not abandon restraint. The manifold benefits of taking pleasure in the Dharma are what he nurtures as his riches. He finds enjoyment in always cultivating the traditions of the spiritually ennobled. When he sees the misery of *saṃsāra,* he generates thoughts of dread.
>>
>> For this reason he always takes pleasure in practicing the ascetic disciplines, alone, without companions, like the single horn of a rhinoceros. [Seeing all] compounded things as suffering and without

> self, he possesses gnosis and deep faith, abiding in true exertion *[samyakprahāṇa].*
>
> Seeing the Dharma for himself, he does not fall into heterodoxy. He always dwells in remote areas as praised by the Buddha. Purified *[dhuta],* secluded, and without distress, [the bodhisattva] is without contention, cognizant of his own manifold shortcomings. Aloof from associations and divorced from flattery, [the bodhisattva] takes pleasure in dwelling in the wilderness.[60]

Having described the bodhisattva path at length to Viśuddhaśraddhā, the Buddha tells Ānanda that she will be reborn in the Tuṣita Heaven after five hundred births as a young girl. There she will be able to venerate Maitreya and all the buddhas of the Bhadrakalpa. After 84,000 millions of billions of years, she will herself become a buddha, presiding over a buddha-field for 12,000 years.

When we start to look for it explicitly, we begin to notice how wide-ranging the wilderness-dwelling motif is within Mahāyāna *sūtra* literature, even when it is not the central preoccupation of any given text. In fact, wilderness dwelling shows up in places where we might least expect it, including texts that are overtly hostile to the monks who practice it. That even some Mahāyāna *sūtra*s qualify or oppose the wilderness for its members reminds us that we are witnessing one dimension of the dialectic of tradition. Before considering the *Rāṣṭrapāla*'s place within this dialectic, we should have a glimpse at some contrary voices within the Mahāyāna.

Opponents of Wilderness Dwelling

Not all Buddhist monks, even within the Mahāyāna fold, were sympathetic to wilderness dwelling and the practice of the *dhutaguṇa*s. The central concern for some Mahāyāna authors was liberating gnosis, not a critique of derelict monks. Such texts then may criticize the preoccupation with vocation as a misdirection of energies, a lack of focus on the higher virtues. A good example of such criticism can be found in the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* (hereafter *Aṣṭa*).

In chapter 21 of this early piece of Mahāyāna literature, we witness a debate from within a bodhisattva sodality on the susceptibility of forest monks to pride and conceit.[61] The chapter opens by describing how a bodhisattva could become deceived by the evil Māra to believe that he (the bodhisattva) had formerly received a prediction from a buddha to complete and perfect enlightenment. Māra, perhaps in the guise of a fellow monk or relative, will convince him that his current spiritual qualities—and here the text mentions specifically an extended list of

the classic *dhutaguṇa*s—are an indication that he has possessed those same qualities in the past.[62] The bodhisattva will grow haughty as a result, claiming to have attained the stage of irreversibility while possessing no such attributes. Such a self-professed bodhisattva, the text claims, is far from the gnosis of a buddha and in fact belongs to the level of a *śrāvaka* or *pratyekabuddha.*

Māra will tell such a gullible bodhisattva that detachment is praised by the Realized One and that one becomes detached by living in the wilderness. But, the Buddha interjects, this is not what I teach as detachment:

> When [Subhūti] had thus spoken, the Blessed One addressed him as follows: "If, Subhūti, a bodhisattva *mahāsattva* is detached, [by which I mean] detached from the mental fixations associated with the *śrāvaka* or with the *pratyekabuddha,* then this bodhisattva *mahāsattva* truly dwells detached. Even if he dwells on the outskirts of a village, provided that he has mastered the perfection of wisdom and skill in creative stratagems *[upāyakauśalya]* and dwells in the state of loving-kindness and great compassion toward all sentient beings—dwelling in that state, he [can be said] to truly dwell detached. This, Subhūti, is what I have authorized as the detachment from the mental fixations associated with the *śrāvaka* or with the *pratyekabuddha* for the bodhisattva *mahāsattva.* A bodhisattva *mahāsattva* dwells detached who passes his days and nights dwelling in this sort of detachment. If a bodhisattva *mahāsattva* dwells in this state in lodgings [lit. "beds and seats"] in the hinterlands, abiding in the wilderness or forest, or in mountain caves or cemeteries, that bodhisattva *mahāsattva* dwells detached.
>
> What Māra, the Evil One, will call detachment, Subhūti—merely dwelling in abodes in the hinterlands, abiding in the wilderness or forest, or in mountain caves or cemeteries, but still being contaminated by the mental fixations associated with the *śrāvaka* or with the *pratyekabuddha*—will not cause him [the bodhisattva] to accomplish omniscience, since he fails to apply himself to the perfection of wisdom. Thus dwelling in a contaminated state, he dwells with impure mental fixations; so too are his bodily, verbal, and mental acts impure.
>
> As a result, he whose bodily, verbal, and mental acts are impure will despise other bodhisattvas *mahāsattva*s who dwell on the outskirts of villages but who are uncontaminated by the mental fixations associated with the *śrāvaka* or with the *pratyekabuddha* and who abide in wisdom, creative stratagems, and great compassion. Even dwelling in the wilderness, he whose bodily, verbal, and mental acts are impure is a contaminated dweller, not a detached dweller. He despises those who dwell on the outskirts of a village though they abide in wisdom, creative stratagems, and

> great compassion; and their behavior is pure with regard to their bodily, verbal, and mental acts; and they are detached from the mental fixations associated with the *śrāvaka* or with the *pratyekabuddha.* So much does he despise them that he will not come to obtain the states of meditation, concentration, trances, approaches to liberation, or supernormal faculties. For him they will remain unfulfilled. Why? Because he is devoid of skill in creative stratagems.[63]

A bodhisattva who has been so deceived by Māra as to believe that his mere dwelling in the wilderness will guarantee his eventual acquisition of omniscience and who as a result develops a haughty, conceited attitude is said at the end of this chapter to be an outcaste bodhisattva, a defamer of bodhisattvas—in short, an impostor.

It is no accident that Māra figures prominently in this passage as he does elsewhere in the *Aṣṭa.* As the embodiment of cosmological evil, Māra is blamed for dissension within the ranks. He disturbs fellowship among bodhisattvas by planting divisive ideas within the minds of those who are insufficiently matured, either because they are only newly admitted to the fold or because they are still under the influence of the Mainstream establishment, that is to say, not yet "detached from the mental fixations associated with the *śrāvaka* or with the *pratyekabuddha.*" Metaphysical dualism, "purity within, corruption without," is precisely what we would expect within the rhetoric of a small, minority sect movement. As Mary Douglas has remarked: "It takes a certain kind of social experience to start to worry about the problem of evil."[64] External critique is expected. But internal dissent is more difficult to account for and more dangerous to a fledging movement still lacking institutional self-confidence. Thus insiders need an explanation for dissent that does not jeopardize the commitment of those who are new to the fold. For its part, the *Aṣṭa* makes clear that such arrogance among bodhisattvas cannot be tolerated. Its rebuke is harsh: conceit is more damaging than even the five heinous sins.[65]

The *Aṣṭa* and other "gnostic" texts like it want to undermine the preoccupation with the wilderness of a text like the *Rāṣṭrapāla.* It wants to shift the attention away from lifestyle reform and toward cognitive transformation—the sort of genuine detachment that makes vocation all but irrelevant. And yet the discussion in the *Aṣṭa* would make little sense unless it was preceded by injunctions very much like those found in the *Rāṣṭrapāla.* That is not to say the *Rāṣṭrapāla* necessarily was on the minds of its authors or even that the *Rāṣṭrapāla* predates the *Aṣṭa.* But some confrontation like that portrayed in the *Rāṣṭrapāla* must have been known to the authors of the *Aṣṭa.* Otherwise their argument would have made little sense within a community of self-identified bodhisattvas.

It is also worth noting that the audience to which the *Aṣṭa* is directed is not

the same as that intended for the *Rāṣṭrapāla.* The *Aṣṭa* is engaged here in an intrafraternal debate. It is concerned to incapacitate dissent within the ranks of fellow Mahāyānists and, more probably, particularly those aligned with its textual production and circulation. The *Rāṣṭrapāla* by contrast is an intramonastic debate. Its critique is aimed at fellow monks whose behavior had deviated from what the authors deemed to be canonically mandated. And this critique appears to have been directed at both *śrāvaka*s and bodhisattvas. These two debates are not mutually exclusive. They must have often overlapped. But in our struggle to understand the ways in which Mahāyāna networks were formed and maintained, it is especially important to sensitize ourselves to subtleties of voice and tone.[66]

The other message the *Aṣṭa* wants to convey here is the importance of attaining skill in creative stratagems and great compassion. Wilderness dwelling for its own sake, as a limited strategy of self cultivation, lacks altruism, the sine qua non of buddhahood. The authors in effect accuse certain wilderness dwellers of disabling the very techniques (meditation, concentration, and so forth) that would make spiritual progress possible. The *Aṣṭa* then essentially wants to qualify the experience of the *āraṇyaka* in terms of motivation. Other Mahāyāna *sūtra*s, however, will be more overtly hostile to wilderness dwelling as a vocation. The *Sarvadharmāpravṛtti-nirdeśa,* a text that almost certainly postdates the *Aṣṭa* by several centuries, appears to be responding to a somewhat different social milieu. Here we see a manifestation of a classical contrast between "gnostics," those skilled in meditative disciplines, and "scholars," those who preserve and circulate the Dharma.[67] A rather extended passage from this not-so-well-known *sūtra* merits translation in full:

> At that time there was a monk named Cāritramati, who was endowed with an extremely pure accruement of morality *[śīlaskandha],* who had obtained the five worldly supernormal faculties, and who was also devoted to the canon of monastic law. This monk, while living amidst his retinue, was given toward the most excellent austerities[68] and inclined toward frugality *[luhādhimuktaḥ].* He had a monastery founded, and while living there, he also established those in his retinue in the extremely pure accruement of morality, and they were devoted to the vows of ascetic practice *[dhutaguṇasaṃvara].* This monk exerted himself vigorously and always abided in the aspiration for enlightenment. He urged other bodhisattvas toward the very same behavior and admonished them with regard to the view of reliance upon objectification *[upalambha-dṛṣṭi].* He led them to hold that all conditioned things are impermanent, that all conditioned things are suffering, and that all conditioned things are devoid of self. This monk was skilled in meditative concentration, and even though he was not

skilled in the career of the bodhisattva, he was nonetheless endowed with meritorious roots.

The dharma-preacher monk Viśuddhacāritra was versed in knowing the most excellent and the most inferior faculties of sentient beings. As many as there were in his retinue, they too applied themselves to the vows of ascetic practice, possessed the tolerance of inconceivability *[anupalambha-kṣānti],* and were skilled in creative stratagems.

Thereupon, son of good family, the dharma-preacher Viśuddhacāritra, together with his retinue, arrived at the monastery where the monk Cāritramati lived and took up residence there. From this monastery they repeatedly went to town out of compassion for sentient beings; after taking their meal [i.e., making their alms rounds] among the townsfolk, they returned to the monastery. Among these townsfolk Viśuddhacāritra converted many hundreds of thousands of families. As many as there were in his retinue, they too became versed in good conduct. His followers went among these townsfolk and taught the Dharma to sentient beings. They established many hundreds of thousands of living beings in unexcelled, complete and perfect enlightenment.

The followers of the monk Cāritramati applied themselves to meditation and did not circulate [on alms rounds] in town. Then the monk Cāritramati, having induced a lack of faith in other bodhisattvas, sounded the monastery's gong. Gathering the assembly of monks, he issued a rule: no one among us is to go to town. He admonished them: "Because you act thoughtlessly and speak unsparingly, what do you think you're doing by going to town? Since living in the wilderness was approved and praised by the Blessed One, you should practice by taking pleasure in meditation without going to town."

Viśuddhacāritra's followers did not obey his directive, but went again to the villages. Son of good family, thereupon when these monks returned from town, the monk Cāritramati again sounded the gong and convened the assembly of monks. He admonished them: "Thus, if henceforth you go to town, you may not live in this monastery." Son of good family, thereupon the dharma-preacher monk Viśuddhacāritra, in order to protect the minds of his monks, called to his own followers saying: "None of you may go to town." At that time, because so many sentient beings who were matured by these monks no longer encountered the monks, they became extremely unhappy, and their meritorious roots were also diminished. Son of good family, when three months had elapsed, the dharma-preacher monk Viśuddhacāritra moved from this monastery to another, and going to the surrounding towns, cities, provinces, counties, and royal palaces, he taught sentient beings the Dharma.

Son of good family, then the monk Cāritramati declared to many peo-

> ple: "Again I see that the dharma-preacher Viśuddhacāritra goes repeatedly to town. In his retinue I see those of vulgar deportment; moreover, he induces a lack of faith in them. This monk is possessed of confused and perverted morality. How can he obtain enlightenment? This monk's enlightenment is surely far off. This monk lives amidst the bustle of the world."
>
> Son of good family, then, later, when the monk Cāritramati had died, he fell into the Avīci Hell on account of the ripening of his karma. After enduring the suffering of this great hell for 99,000 millions of aeons, he obtained ill repute for sixty rebirths. For 32,000 rebirths he lapsed repeatedly from the renunciant life. Through the remainder of his own karmic obstruction, he became a renunciant under the dispensation of the Realized One, Arhat, Complete and Perfectly Enlightened Buddha Vimalārciṣmat. Even though, after renouncing, he practiced assiduously [lit. "as if the crown of his head were on fire"] for 600,000 millions of years, he did not attain even the tolerance of what is conformable [to the truth] *[ānulomika(dharma)-kṣānti]* and was dull-witted for many hundreds of thousands of rebirths.
>
> Son of good family, you should not think the dharma-preacher monk Viśuddhacāritra was at that time someone else. Why? At that time the dharma-preacher monk Viśuddhacāritra was none other than the Realized One Ākampya.[69] Son of good family, you should not think that at that time the dharma-preacher monk Cāritramati was someone else. Why? Because I was the dharma-preacher monk Cāritramati. Because of such limited stratagems, I too induced a lack of faith in him. On account of my accumulation of karmic obstructions, I fell into the hells.[70]

Interestingly, the Buddha here reveals his own faulty attempt to progress toward enlightenment as a forest dweller in the distant past. This is a powerful statement. Texts like the *Rāṣṭrapāla* drew upon the Buddha's own bodhisattva career, detailed in the many available *jātaka* narratives, to critique what they saw to be their fellow monks' degenerate lifestyle. The *Sarvadharmāpravṛtti-nirdeśa* rejects that strategy: even the Buddha himself strayed during his long bodhisattva training. Any attempt by contemporary bodhisattvas then to draw upon him as a precedent would be undermined, presumably by a monastic faction that placed greater value in preaching than in reclusion.[71]

The Dialectic of Tradition

Buddhist reclusion has long struggled between two poles: the meditating virtuoso on the outermost fringes of human civilization, an ascetic who earned his

reputation from years of austerity; and the domesticated monk, sedentary and respectable, perhaps scholarly, but more often a ritual specialist attuned to the needs of the laity. These two poles are essentially coterminous with Weber's charismatic and bureaucratic modes of leadership. Buddhist monks come down at various places along this continuum, to some degree in response to the socio-economic milieu in which they find themselves.[72] A fully domesticated *saṅgha* must reject the forest option. The former simply cannot hold their own against the latter when it comes to securing lay patronage. And the *Rāṣṭrapāla* makes it clear that patronage was never far from the minds of their contemporaries.

However, it was the very success of wilderness-dwelling monks in acquiring patronage that eventually compromised this ascetic thrust. This dialectic—reform, corruption/domestication, and renewed reform—is a recurring pattern in monastic culture everywhere: "As is well known, monastic wealth became a major source of corruption and relaxation of ascetic standards. Paradoxically, laymen tended to bestow donations and protection on monasteries or orders that they perceived as purer or holier, in a process usually leading to further monastic slackening and need for reform."[73] The authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* are themselves aware of wilderness dwellers whose motives they regarded as thoroughly compromised:

> Even among those who dwell in the forest, their thoughts will be preoccupied with the village. The mind of those who burn with the fire of the defilements is not steady.
>
> Forgetting all the virtues of the Buddha as well as the rules of training, the ascetic disciplines, and stratagems, those full of pride, arrogance, and conceit fall to the dreadful Avīcī Hell.[74]

As we will see in the following chapter, these wilderness dwellers are judged to be hypocrites because they have adopted this lifestyle expressly for the elevated status it conferred and the accompanying patronage such a status generated—hence the authors' tireless preoccupation with "profit and honor."

The *Rāṣṭrapāla* for its part wants to have it both ways. Its authors clearly sought to co-opt the charismatic power of the genuine wilderness ascetic, distant, aloof, and therefore unbeholden to patrons. But they also intended to locate that power within the structure and authority of the monastic institution. If they have to live in the forest now, it is because the conditions in the monastery do not make it possible to live as real monks otherwise. At no point, however, do we sense that the wilderness life was understood to obviate the disciplinary strictures of classical Buddhist monasticism. Thus I cannot emphasize enough how off the mark is Ray's assumption of an antimonastic stance in the

Rāṣṭrapāla: "For the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā Sūtra,* the forest ideal of the text is called a bodhisattva, and the text presents what seems to be a blanket condemnation of *bhikṣu*s, implying that the *bhikṣu*s as such will lead to the destruction of the dharma."[75] There can be no doubt of the monastic context for the authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla.* I would go so far as to say that its authors may not even have been able to envision a nonmonastic version of the bodhisattva path. They could, however, envision a version of monastic life that differed considerably from that which surrounded them. Their critique of their fellow monastics will be the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER FOUR

"Profit and Honor"

A Critique of Sedentary Monasticism

> I fear, wherever riches have increased, the essence of religion has decreased in the same proportion. Therefore I do not see how it is possible, in the nature of things, for any revival of true religion to continue long. For religion must necessarily produce both industry and frugality, and these cannot but produce riches. But as riches increase, so will pride, anger, and love of the world in all its branches.
>
> —John Wesley, founder of the Methodist church[1]

The *Rāṣṭrapāla* is in many ways a Puritan tract. Its authors were clearly disillusioned with what the institution of Buddhist monasticism had become in their day. Like the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century reformers in the Church of England, they championed an ascetic vision, a return to the righteous times of the first disciples. Sharp-tongued and curmudgeonly, the authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* set out to defend the Buddha's Dharma against the tide of monastic laxity and wantonness to which they saw it succumbing. Accusing their monastic confrères of fawning after patrons and consorting with householders, they describe a *saṅgha* that had accommodated itself to its socioeconomic environment with considerable aplomb. And they were, to say the least, not very happy about this.

These concerns of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* show it to be closely allied with a significant strand of early Mahāyāna literature, namely, the sharp criticism of sedentary monasticism and the elevation of ascetically inclined forest dwellers. Given that monks for most of the history of Indian Buddhism participated in complex relationships with the laity and their fellow monks, our contemporary caricature of the ideal monk is a far cry from how the average monk in the first few centuries of the Common Era actually lived and practiced his religion. Meditating monks were the exception, not the rule.[2] The distribution of resources, in contrast, was a constant problem requiring extensive legal maneuvering in the formation of monastic law codes. It was in this context that reform-minded monks began authoring strong reactions against what had become Mainstream

monasticism, and some of these reactions find expression in a number of Mahāyāna texts.

Few Mahāyāna *sūtra*s, however, rail against the establishment quite like the *Rāṣṭrapāla*. Its authors repeatedly characterize their contemporaries as given to arrogance, envy, conceit, and pride. Such monks constantly engage in backbiting of their fellow recluses while shamelessly soliciting wealthy patrons in towns and villages. Indeed, our author tells us:

> A householder is not as covetous with passions as these [corrupt monks] are after going forth. They would have wives, sons, and daughters just like a householder.
>
> At which household they are favored with robes, alms, and requisites, they are desirous of the [householder's] wife, for these ignoble ones are always under the spell of defilements.[3]

These charges may not be as outlandish as they sound. When we have extracanonical sources, generally on the periphery of the Indian Buddhist world, we find similar complaints. In describing the moral decay of the *saṅgha* in medieval Sri Lanka, for example, the author of the *Mahāvaṃsa* notes: "In the villages owned by the Sangha the morality of the monks consisted only in supporting their wives and children."[4] From the other side of the Indianized Buddhist world—and at a time that may be roughly contemporaneous with the composition of the *Rāṣṭrapāla*—a similar portrait of monastic behavior would have looked all too familiar to our author. Among the documents from the ancient Shanshan kingdom found at Niya (in modern Xinjiang, China), we find records of monks who gave their daughters away in marriage to other monks (no. 418); injunctions that imposed fines on monks who arrived at the *uposatha* ceremony in householder's garb (no. 489); some who owned slaves and kept servants (no. 506)—in short, monks who in many respects led lives within the household and not in segregated communities.[5] Whether such activities of Buddhist professionals were common outside of Niya is difficult to know, but the remarks in the *Rāṣṭrapāla* are suggestive.[6]

What makes such behavior by these monks all the more reprehensible, the *Rāṣṭrapāla* continues, is their hypocrisy: "They always say to householders: 'These passions are not to be followed; they will cause you to fall into the realm of animals, of the *preta*s, or to the hells.' And yet, they themselves are undisciplined and without composure."[7] Such corrupt monks are said to regularly fawn after the laity, exacting alms and seeking prestige through trickery and boasting. Even within the monastery these monks are said to be no less self-serving.

Forsaking meditation and study, they busy themselves with monastery affairs. They reserve dwellings and requisites for their companions, meanwhile turning away virtuous monks. And perhaps most damning, they make no distinctions in the property belonging to the *saṅgha,* to the Buddha (i.e., the *stūpa*), or to individuals.[8]

If our author appears intolerant of his fellow monks, he is no less reticent in having the Buddha predict the ultimate consequences of their behavior:

> This most delightful teaching of mine, a treasure of virtue, the source of all virtues, will now pass away to destruction on account of the failure of morality and the sins of envy and pride.[9]

> The destruction of the Dharma occurs during the very dreadful final period. And such undisciplined monks as these will cause the ruin of this religion of mine.[10]

Jan Nattier has studied the prophecies of decline in Buddhist literature at great length and with great profit.[11] I should note, however, that at several places, the phrasing of this concept in the *Rāṣṭrapāla* would seem to conflict with her thesis that *paścimakāla* refers only to the "latter period" after the Buddha's *parinirvāṇa,* and not to a final, degenerate age.[12] The alternation of *paścimakāla* and *carimakāla* (final period) at the end of the "Prologue" of our text confirms the sense of a last or final period, an age also described as "very dreadful" *(sughore).* Moreover, Nattier asserts that among the internal causes for the decline of the Dharma (i.e., laxity within the *saṅgha*), "nowhere is there any explicit mention of the importance of keeping the precepts."[13] Again, the *Rāṣṭrapāla* would seem to contradict this assertion: monks "who are far removed from morality and virtue" (17.14), "who are preoccupied with profit and inimical to virtue" (31.16), and "who are undisciplined" (32.6) are regularly blamed for hastening the degeneration of the religion. For the *Rāṣṭrapāla* at least, morality, explicitly referred to as adherence to the *prātimokṣa* (disciplinary codes) and *vinaya* (monastic law), is central to the preservation of the true Dharma.

It would be easy, on the face of it, to miss the significance of this last remark: "They [corrupt monks] have no regard for the rules of training or for the *prātimokṣa* or *vinaya*" (30.11). Within the context of a fully domesticated *saṅgha,* being versed in the *vinaya* for a monk is a potentially revolutionary act.[14] Although, as we shall see below, *vinaya* literature had made a number of accommodations for sedentary monastic life, it also preserved regulations, however archaic, that intended the monk to live apart from both secular society and secular values. A monk who took it upon himself not only to learn these out-

moded rules, but to take them seriously, could ask some very uncomfortable questions of his brethren. In this sense, the authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* often appear as disciplinary fundamentalists.[15] That their monastic confrères did not appreciate their charges also comes across quite clearly.

The Mainstream Monastic Background

One can see in these few citations above, which could easily be multiplied, that the tone throughout is severe and acerbic. We must agree, I think, with Finot in seeing these charges—all too graphic and precise—as reflecting real conditions known to and, in all probability, affecting the author and/or subsequent editors of the text.[16] The authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* want to introduce reform—clearly they found the lifestyle of their fellow monastics wanting—so as to return to what they took to be the original precepts of the Buddha. There is no reason to assume that their brethren were significantly affected by this jeremiad. But if our author is to be believed, some of them at least took notice, even if they were less than sympathetic. In order to appreciate the difficulty of their uphill battle, we will need a better understanding of the institutional monasticism to which they were responding.

As we learn more about the social and economic life of Indian monasteries, owing in no small measure to the recent studies on the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* by Gregory Schopen, our authors' complaints become a little easier to understand. What Schopen has termed the Middle Period of Indian Buddhism, roughly the first half of the first millennium, can be characterized by a highly organized, sedentary monasticism with a complex administration governed by an equally complex legal system. Monks living in these monasteries were bound in a tangled web of relationships to lay donors and their fellow monks, relationships that required the constant negotiation of property rights and ritual obligations.[17] The monastic disciplinary codes give every indication that the monks governed by them were fully entrenched in the socioeconomic milieu of contemporary society and were "preoccupied—if not obsessed—with avoiding any hint of social criticism and with maintaining the status quo at almost any cost."[18]

Such monastics generated revenue—often, considerable revenue—by the performance of religious services for hire. In fact, the *vinaya*s matter of factly describe individual monks of great private wealth; in some cases, this wealth was sufficient to attract the attention of royal authorities.[19] And there can be little doubt that monasteries acquired substantial communal assets, including permanent endowments, often at the behest of lay donors concerned with the regular performance of mortuary rites.[20] These same monastic codes issued rules for the trafficking in servants and slaves, and as Schopen points out, these

rules "can hardly be unrelated to the attacks on and criticisms of certain aspects of institutional monasticism found in Mahāyāna *sūtra* literature."[21]

These sources, both literary and epigraphic, point to "the emergence in India of a new type of social institution with considerable economic clout: the fully institutionalized, permanently housed, landed monastery."[22] Under these conditions, the strident objections of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* are not only understandable, but almost predictable. The *Rāṣṭrapāla,* and other Mahāyāna *sūtra*s participating in this ascetic genre, may well reflect minority voices crying out for the good old days, a time when life was simpler if more rigorous, when public expectations of monks were few.[23]

The Mainstream tradition was not without its own critics of monastic laxity. More than a few passages scattered throughout the Pāli canon demonstrate deep concern for the growing degeneration of substantial portions of the *saṅgha.* Consider, for example, the following passage from the *Saṃyutta-nikāya,* where the renowned forest dweller Kassapa bemoans the declining interest in the ascetic disciplines, the increased pandering to monks successful in acquiring patronage, and the ill effects of both on young monks. Here Kassapa responds to the Buddha's suggestion that he deliver a sermon:

> Nowadays, Venerable One, monks are foul-mouthed, endowed with qualities that make them fractious, intolerant, and poor at receiving instruction.

The Buddha replies:

> How true, Kassapa. Formerly elder monks were wilderness dwellers and sang the praises of wilderness dwelling. They were alms-food eaters and sang the praises of alms begging. They were refuse-rag wearers and sang the praises of wearing refuse-rag robes. They were triple-robe wearers and sang the praises of triple-robe wearing. They had few wants and sang the praises of wanting little. They were satisfied and sang the praises of satisfaction. They were secluded and sang the praises of seclusion. They were not inclined toward intimacy with others and sang the praises of aloofness. They were zealous in their resolve and sang the praises of zealous resolution. . . .
>
> But nowadays, Kassapa, elder monks are not wilderness dwellers and they do not sing the praises of wilderness dwelling. They are not alms-food eaters and do not sing the praises of alms begging. . . . They are not zealous in their resolve and do not sing the praises of zealous resolution.
>
> Under these circumstances, the monk who is well known, famous, and in possession of the [monastic] requisites of robes, bowls, lodging, and medicines, him the elder monks invite to sit down: "Come, monk. What is your

> name? This is indeed a monk of good repute. This is indeed a monk who enjoys the company of his fellow wayfarers. Come, monk. Sit on this seat."
>
> Then, Kassapa, it occurs to the newly ordained monks: "Whichever monk is well known, famous, and in possession of the requisites . . . him the elder monks invite. . . . " The newly ordained monks follow in this way. This results in their harm and suffering for a long time.[24]

In addition, there are some strongly worded remarks in the *Theragāthā* that describe conditions very much reminiscent of those we observed above from the *Rāṣṭrapāla.* In fact, the phrasing of the critiques in the *Theragāthā* leads me to think that the authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* may well have had this text—or one very much like it—in mind when formulating their own charges. The overlap in language is in a number of places striking. Clearly their criticisms of their contemporaries would carry more force if their charges were cloaked in phrasing that paralleled that of well-known scriptures universally recognized as spoken by the Buddha. I translate here only a small selection of verses from the poems dedicated to the elders Pārāpariya and Phussa:

> The following thought occurred to the ascetic [Pārāpariya] in the great forest, all abloom, while he was focused, secluded, seated in meditation:
>
> "The deportment of monks appears to be different today than when the Lord of the World, the Most Excellent of Men, was living.
>
> "They [monks in the past] made use [of their robe] in proper moderation, as a protection from a cold breeze and as a loin covering; they were satisfied with anything at all.
>
> "Whether [their food] was excellent or coarse, meager or abundant, they ate for sustenance without greed or attachment.
>
> "They were not excessively greedy for the necessities of life, for medicine and [other] requisites, as they were for the destruction of their depravities *[āsava].*
>
> "Devoting themselves to seclusion in the wilderness, at the foot of trees, in caves and grottoes, they lived intent upon their goal. . . .
>
> "Those elders whose depravities are all exhausted, supreme meditators, great benefactors—they are now gone to *nibbāna.* Now such men are few.

> "On account of the loss of meritorious qualities and wisdom, the religion of the Victor, which is endowed with all the most excellent properties, is destroyed.
>
> "The time when evil qualities and defilements reign is when those in possession of the remnants of the True Dhamma must turn toward seclusion. . . .
>
> "Those [corrupt monks] who pursued pretexts, methods, and suppositions accumulate much wealth by [devious] means for the sake of their livelihood.
>
> "They convene the assembly [of monks] for business, not for the Dhamma. They teach the Dhamma to others for profit and not for [sincere] purpose. . . .
>
> "Undisciplined in this way, some shaven-headed ascetics wear the waist-cloth *[saṃghāṭi]* of a monk, but they desire only reverence, infatuated as they are with profit and honor."[25]

The following set of verses are a sample of the response by the elder Phussa to a query about the future state of the monastic order:

> In the future there will be many who are prone to anger, grumbling, hypocrisy, obstinacy, deceit, and jealousy; they will adhere to various [heretical] doctrines.
>
> Thinking themselves to be knowledgeable in the profound Dhamma and within sight of the far shore [of *nibbāna*], they are in fact lightweights, disrespectful toward the Dhamma and without respect for each other.
>
> Many dangers will arise in the world in the future; fools will defile this well-taught Dhamma.
>
> The self-confident will run the affairs in the assembly despite being devoid of virtue; the garrulous and ignorant will become powerful.
>
> But the virtuous who run the affairs in the assembly according to right principles, who are conscientious and without ulterior motives, will be weak.

> In the future the stupid will appropriate for themselves silver and gold, fields, property, goats and sheep, and male and female slaves. . . .
>
> They will be desirous of profit, indolent, lacking zeal; having wearied of the forest hinterlands,[26] they will dwell in villages.
>
> The unrestrained will imitate and associate with those who obtain wealth, who always delight in wrong livelihood. . . .
>
> Thus do these fools, without respect for one another, lack training. They will not pay heed to their preceptors *[upajjhāye],* just as an unruly horse fails to mind a charioteer.
>
> In the future the behavior of monks and nuns will be like this, when the final period has arrived.[27]

Much like the authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla,* the poets who composed these sections of the *Theragāthā* were similarly distraught with the decline of the Dharma in the end times, when degenerate religious—monks in appearance only—will preoccupy themselves with monastery affairs in their thirst for profit and honor. These passages highlight the fact that concern for monastic corruption was not limited by spiritual orientation. It was, on the contrary, part of a long-standing dialectic of reform within the Buddhist tradition. In that case, then, we will need to consider how bodhisattva critics of the establishment distinguished themselves—if they did—from their *śrāvaka* colleagues who might also have rejected sedentary monasticism.

Relations between Bodhisattvas and Their Co-religionists

One of the questions that plagues our attempts to fathom the ascetic fringe of the early Mahāyāna, as typified by such texts as the *Rāṣṭrapāla,* the *Kāśyapaparivarta,* the *Ratnarāśi,* and the *Ugraparipṛcchā,* is how the motives of the bodhisattva *āraṇyaka*s differed from those of their Mainstream brethren who also lived in the forest. After all, if the fundamental problem of life in sedentary monasteries has to do with monastic laxity, and if such monasteries were no longer—if they ever were—adequate sites for spiritual cultivation, then why not leave the monastery behind for a life in the forest dedicated to the pursuit of arhatship? In other words, what attracted such monks not only to the more difficult discipline of the wilderness dweller, but also specifically to the Mahāyāna,

a minority movement presumably on the fringe of social, economic, and cultic prestige?[28]

The decision to join a bodhisattva network requires explanation especially when it appears to have been fraught with significant difficulties. It is clear, for example, that a later editor or compiler of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* decided his allegiance amidst considerable opposition and even hostility from his confrères. In what is a striking interpolation within a Mahāyāna *sūtra,* constituting a sharp interruption of narrative voice, the editor of the extant Sanskrit text lets slip the fact that his teacher—and his teacher's teacher—called the very authenticity of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* into question:

> My teacher was an ocean of knowledge, very learned, the best of expounders [of the Dharma]. And yet this *[sūtra]* was forbidden by him: "it is by no means the word of the Buddha."
>
> Moreover, he too had an aged teacher, also possessed of an unlimited abundance of virtues, and this *[sūtra]* was also not accepted by him: "Do not apply yourself to it; it is false."[29]

This passage is extraordinary in that it demonstrates that a later editor or compiler had already circulated some primitive version of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* despite his teacher's objections.[30]

Mahāyāna *sūtra* compilers regularly allude to the fact that their contemporaries refused to accept such texts as authentic words of the Buddha, often ridiculing those who professed them. Consider, again, these verses from the *Rāṣṭrapāla:*

> When they hear this tranquil Dharma, these ignoble ones, who are always hostile to the Dharma, who offend against the religion, and who are devoid of virtues, declare: "This was not spoken by the Victor."[31]
>
> Invented, imagined by the evil-minded and by those who think like heretical teachers [are the Mahāyāna teachings]. The Victor could never have said these words, which are a rebuke against monks.[32]

The *Rāṣṭrapāla* is not alone in reflecting such charges. In the *Ratnarāśi* the Buddha warns Kāśyapa that there will be deluded *śramaṇa*s who will not accept the authenticity of this *sūtra:*

> I did not create an opportunity in such a teaching as this, Kāśyapa, for those deluded people who do not produce even so much as one thought

> imbued with liberation. But nevertheless, when they hear such teachings they understand that they have offended against what I established, and they think to slander it saying: "These are not what was spoken by the Buddha, but rather they are one's own personal fabrications, or created by Māra to cause havoc." And they will thus mislead many beings.[33]

What is especially curious about such professed rejections is that much of the doctrinal orientation in these early Mahāyāna *sūtra*s is decidedly conservative. There is little difference between much of what they advocate and the views and doctrines that would have been at least familiar to, even if not fully internalized by, Mainstream monks whose putative goal was arhatship. In fact, the *Rāṣṭrapāla* may be even more reactionary than I have suggested. Not only do the authors of the text not argue at length for specifically Mahāyāna doctrines (e.g., *śūnyatā,* "emptiness"), but they are concerned to expose the degree to which their monastic brethren failed to understand such fundamental doctrines as *anātman* (no-self) and traditional karma theory. Such bodhisattvas would have been entirely sympathetic with, if not intimately cognizant of, any number of passages preserved in, say, the *Sutta-nipāta,* whose *sutta*s are widely recognized to be among the earliest extant Buddhist texts. For example, the following verse from the *Khaggavisāṇa-sutta* would fit seamlessly into the *Rāṣṭrapāla:* "Forsaking sons and wife, mother and father, wealth and grain, relatives, and sensual pleasures in their entirety, one should wander alone like a rhinoceros."[34]

From the same collection, the *Muni-sutta,* a text purportedly known to King Aśoka in the third century B.C.E., praises the wandering sage meditating alone in the forest. The *sutta*s of the *Aṭṭhakavagga,* also from the *Sutta-nipāta,* warn over and over of the dangers of haughtiness among renunciants and the benefits of the solitary life. The list could go on.[35] There is very little that is new in the *Rāṣṭrapāla.*[36] Likewise, almost nothing in the *Ratnarāśi* can be described as Mahāyānic.[37] In fact, the *Ratnarāśi* states explicitly that monks of all spiritual orientations will achieve their goals most effectively by living in the wilderness. The passage is sufficiently interesting to quote in full:

> Thus, Kāśyapa, the wilderness monk should dwell in the wilderness by the practice of undertaking such qualities. Those who abide in such qualities are immediately distinguished into followers of the *śrāvaka* vehicle, followers of the *pratyekabuddha* vehicle, or followers of the bodhisattva vehicle. If he is a follower of the *śrāvaka* vehicle, he will quickly obtain the fruit [of the *śramaṇa*]. Even if he is obstructed by karmic obstructions and does not obtain the fruit [in this life], it will not take more than the time of two or three Realized Ones until his mind is liberated from the depravities. If he is a fol-

> lower of the *pratyekabuddha* vehicle, he will quickly obtain *pratyeka-bodhi.* If he is a follower of the bodhisattva vehicle, right now [during this lifetime] he will obtain the tolerance of the fact that [all] things are unproduced. He will see buddhas without hindrance. And having seen buddhas without hindrance, he will quickly attain to unexcelled perfect awakening.[38]

Clearly, then, the *Ratnarāśi* did not share the kind of hostility toward other orientations that is famously present in texts such as the *Lotus Sūtra,* whose characterization of the *ekayāna* (one-vehicle) doctrine has strongly influenced—and continues to influence—contemporary understandings of the Mahāyāna. The authors of the *Ratnarāśi* assumed that multiple goals existed among monks and that this diversity was unproblematic. But they elevated the vocation of the wilderness monk as the most effective method for achieving each of them.

Almost nothing about the *Rāṣṭrapāla* can be called revolutionary. The practices it advocates are all quite standard fare. We see surprisingly little in the way of doctrinal innovation, certainly far less than in some other Mahāyāna *sūtra*s. This is a text composed by individuals uncomfortable with the Mainstream social world but not, it would seem, with its thought world. The word "Hīnayāna" (Lesser Vehicle), for example, does not appear in the text, while the term "Mahāyāna" occurs only once.[39] There is little concern here for contrasting themselves with those of other spiritual orientations.[40] In fact, the text states explicitly that sentient beings may achieve *nirvāṇa* by means of any of the three vehicles.[41]

This is not to say, however, that the authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* did not consider the bodhisattva path to be a superior option, only that their agenda did not require an overt confrontation with alternative orientations. Other Mahāyāna texts also assumed that a given *nikāya* could tolerate different vocations and that monks of different stripes could cohabitate in the same monastery, presumably without conflict. Consider the following passage from the *Ugraparipṛcchā:*

> And when he [the householder bodhisattva] goes inside the monastery, he should reflect on all the activities of the community of monks as follows: "Which monk is a learned one? Which monk is a Dharma-preacher? Which monk is a Vinaya-holder? Which monk is a Mātṛkā-holder? Which monk is a Bodhisattva-piṭaka-holder? Which monk is a wilderness-dweller? Which monk lives on almsfood? Which monk dresses in rags from the dust heap, has few desires, is satisfied [with what he has], and lives in seclusion? Which monk does yogic practice? Which monk practices meditation? Which monk belongs to the Bodhisattva vehicle? Which monk is in charge of repairs? Which monk is the administrator? Which monk is the overseer?" Thus he should reflect on all the activities of the community of monks. And having reflected on their

> activities, in order to conform to them all, he should dwell in conformity with them. And he should display no other actions in the presence of others.[42]

Note that the authors of the *Ugra* presumed that one could meet wilderness-dwelling monks and monks who practiced the *dhutaguṇa*s within a monastery, confirming our sense—contra Reginald Ray—that *āraṇyaka*s did not spend all of their time in the forest but maintained a regular relationship, however intermittent, with their sedentary brethren.

This passage should be particularly striking to anyone who has read the standard textbook descriptions of Buddhist monastic life, especially with regard to relations between the "vehicles." But with only a little reflection, one sees that the position of the *Ugra* is virtually incumbent upon those who envisioned themselves within the bodhisattva vehicle. For if the goal of the bodhisattva is to attain complete buddhahood, and if as a buddha he will preside over an assembly of monks with multiple spiritual orientations, then it would hardly be consistent with that vision to reject those orientations now. Again, the authors of the *Ugra* make this logic explicit:

> O Eminent Householder, how should the householder bodhisattva go to the Sangha for refuge? O Eminent Householder, as to the householder bodhisattva going to the Sangha for refuge, if he sees monks who are stream-enterers, or once-returners, or non-returners, or Arhats, or ordinary persons (*pṛthagjana*), who are members of the Śrāvaka Vehicle, the Pratyekabuddha Vehicle, or the Great Vehicle, with reverence and respect toward them he exerts himself to stand up, speaks to them pleasantly, and treats them with propriety. Showing reverence toward those he meets with and encounters, he bears in mind the thought "When I have awakened to Supreme Perfect Enlightenment, I will teach the Dharma which brings about [in others] the qualities of a Śrāvaka or a Pratyekabuddha in just this way." Thus having reverence and respect for them, he does not cause them any trouble. That is how a householder bodhisattva goes to the Sangha for refuge.[43]

It is worth noting, parenthetically, how even in the modern period, forest monks in Thailand, Burma, and Sri Lanka, all of whom we would unhesitatingly describe as Mainstream (or, more precisely, Theravādin), have on occasion aspired for the goals of buddhahood or pratyekabuddhahood. Stanley Tambiah has given us a detailed account of the modern forest tradition in Thailand, focusing much of his discussion on the famous *thudong* (Pāli *dhutaṅga*) master Acharn Mun (var. Ajaan Man) (1870–1949). Mun, during long periods of solitary meditation, would often have visions of buddhas and famous arhats from whom he would receive in-

struction. During one of his visionary experiences, Acharn Mun encountered his wife from a former life with whom he had made a vow to become a buddha in the future.[44] Mun's teacher, Acharn Sao, who was even less gregarious than Mun, was said to have made the vow to become a *paccekabuddha.*[45] A number of other famous Thai forest saints modeled their lives on the bodhisattva career of the Buddha, especially as depicted in the *jātaka* tales.[46] In Burma, Spiro reports, there has been a long tradition of select individuals striving for complete buddhahood:

> It is interesting to observe, then, that in Theravadist Burma, where, restricted to a small group, there has been a long tradition of aspiration to Buddhahood, the aspiration is for *Sammāsam,* rather than *Pacceka* (silent) Buddhahood. Most Burmans, to be sure, do not aspire to Buddhahood; the notion staggers the imagination. If the chances of being born even as an ordinary human being are small—in the words of one favorite simile, as the grains of dust on one fingernail compared to all the dust of the earth—imagine the chances of being born as a Buddha! And imagine what hubris is required to entertain such a fantasy. Still, as I have said, there has been in Burma a long and persistent tradition of aspiration to *(Sammāsam)* Buddhahood. I myself have met a few Burmans who refer to themselves as an Embryo Buddha *(hpaya: laung:)* [= bodhisattva] one who is striving for and hopes to attain Buddhahood, though only of course after numerous rebirths. It should be added, moreover, that although few Burmans are experts in the niceties of Buddhist doctrine, I was nevertheless surprised to find vestigial *Bodhisattva* beliefs among them. Even former monks told me, when I asked why they aspire to Buddhahood, that they not only wish to attain nirvana but want to take others with them. And this, they said, they can only do as Buddhas.[47]

Michael Carrithers describes his meeting with the revolutionary Sri Lankan monk Ānandasiri, famous for reinvigorating the forest tradition in the mid-twentieth century. Ānandasiri "hoped to pursue *paññā,* wisdom, just as the Buddha had done in countless lives, as recounted in the Jātaka tales."[48] Unsatisfied with mere arhatship, he set his sights on *bodhi,* complete enlightenment, much to the consternation of his monastic contemporaries.

We see here in modernity what may well have been the case for millennia, namely, that spiritual orientation as scholars have often tried to delineate it with great precision could have been a rather messy affair. In fact, these data may indicate that there are some advantages to differentiating the bodhisattva aspiration from membership in a group self identified as "Mahāyāna." Even if we accept the aspiration toward buddhahood as central to the very definition of what

constitutes a Mahāyānist, it is likely that this orientation was not by itself sufficient. Being a Mahāyānist must also have involved participation within a self-identified bodhisattva network that accepted the authority of at least a certain number of Mahāyāna *sūtras*. In other words, the bodhisattva path seems to have functioned as a pan-Buddhist option: rare in Mainstream circles, generic in Mahāyāna groups. It may not have necessarily elicited a confrontation among co-religionists of different vehicles. Much would depend on the level of resistance such individuals encountered from their fellow monastics. A higher state of tension, perhaps stemming from greater disparities of prestige or economic privilege, may have inspired some individuals to seek alternative rewards beyond those offered by the Mainstream establishment. The emerging Mahāyāna, then, may have distinguished itself in some quarters for its attempt to embrace a virtuoso asceticism that was perceived to be able to provide those rewards. I will return to this issue below.

Under such circumstances, bodhisattva forest monks may have elicited such hostile reactions from their monastic brethren not principally because they opted for an alternative spiritual goal, but because their reinvigoration of wilderness dwelling raised them into sharp relief with their sedentary counterparts. Their fellow monastics, then, had every reason to fear for their livelihood as the more rigorous forest dwellers undermined the credibility of monks who had become too cozy with lay patrons. Rodney Stark has illuminated this dynamic vis-à-vis early Christianity: "Put more bluntly, affluent clergy are never a match for lay preachers and impoverished ascetics in head-to-head credibility contests. . . . In short, the powerful ascetic current that persists in all religious traditions is a natural response to the problem of religious risk."[49]

In this regard the authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* and allied texts walk a fine line. They strongly criticize monks who forsook their role as socially and economically disinterested outsiders, who aligned themselves with prominent upper-class families and were thereby subject to the expectations of their patrons. However, monks are by no means the only, or even the principal, instigators of this relationship. The laity, driven by more immediate concerns and everyday needs, desire to have monks accept their donations so as to produce the reciprocal commodity: merit. The monks, in effect, are a kind of insurance policy, and lay offerings are premium payments.[50] Religious capitalism thus benefits both parties. But this relationship works only insofar as both parties fulfill their obligations. This is why one often finds strong injunctions against sham renunciants accepting gifts. Those who deceitfully present a façade of virtuous behavior, who extort offerings by boasting of their own purity—who, in short, merely look like monks—threaten to undermine the foundations of this transaction. They in effect seduce unwitting patrons to make investments that pay

no dividends.[51] It is seldom long before donors seek out more reliable ventures. Hence the appeal of the genuine forest monk.

The Sociology of the *Rāṣṭrapāla*

We are now in a position to assess more clearly the broader agenda of the *Rāṣṭrapāla.* Like all Mahāyāna *sūtra*s, the goal put forth is the achievement of buddhahood, characterized cognitively by omniscience and somatically by the attainment of the glorified body of a buddha, replete with the thirty-two auspicious marks of the superhuman. These marks are the karmic result of the bodhisattva's aeons-long quest, a journey that required extreme sacrifice and endurance. The sacrifices endured by the Buddha as told in the *jātaka* narratives are prescribed in the *Rāṣṭrapāla* in the form of the ascetic training of the wilderness-dwelling monk. Such a monk leaves behind his corrupt co-religionists, whose pandering to lay donors and secular interests disqualify them from his path. And, as we saw above, these concerns are by no means unique to the *Rāṣṭrapāla.*

The *Rāṣṭrapāla* was clearly directed toward those within the saṅgha. Its authors reject accommodation with the socioeconomic milieu by insisting on a rigorist interpretation of monastic discipline. They have bifurcated the world into insiders and outsiders: the author recounts his own teacher's rejection of the canonicity of this *sūtra* and the wider derision of his fellow monks. And predictions of the imminent demise of the Dharma are explicitly attributed to "the failure of morality and the sins of envy and pride," consistent with the apocalyptic tendencies of certain kinds of marginal religious movements.

The socioreligious context in which the *Rāṣṭrapāla* was composed and circulated can thus be characterized as sectarian, by which I mean that it manifests a form of the classic church-sect schism so often discussed by sociologists of religion. Building on the insights of Ernst Troeltsch's discussion of church-sect patterns in Christianity and Max Weber's socioeconomic analysis of religious organizations, H. Richard Niebuhr first theoretically adumbrated the nature of such schisms in *The Social Sources of Denominationalism* (1929). Despite his narrow focus on splits within Christianity and his only slightly veiled criticisms of contemporary churches, Niebuhr did much to steer the discussion away from theological disputation as an adequate explanation of schism. Instead he saw class conflict to be at the heart of religious dissatisfaction and the degree of dissatisfaction to situate individuals of different endowments in more or less antagonism with the status quo. Since Niebuhr, great strides have been made by a number of theorists. My analysis here draws upon these more recent works.[52]

Sects leave the parent body not because they wish to found something new, but rather because they wish to reestablish something old, the original tradition

from which the "church" has drifted.[53] A schism occurs when the degree of deviance between a religious network and its immediate environment reaches an intolerable level, thus requiring some form of departure from the dominant group.[54] Such a split, however, may or may not involve a significant ideological shift. As Stark and Bainbridge define them, "a sect movement is a deviant religious organization with *traditional* beliefs and practices," while "a cult movement is a deviant religious organization with *novel* beliefs and practices."[55] This definition has important implications for our understanding of the Mahāyāna more generally. As I've stated a number of times above, very little in the *Rāṣṭrapāla* can be described as innovative on the level of doctrine or praxis. Its concern throughout is with the purification of the *saṅgha* as classically conceived. Insofar as it is the product of a deviant religious group, this group can be termed a sect by the above definition. But other Mahāyāna texts do advocate entirely novel beliefs and practices. Texts generated by such groups, and here we might think of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* or the *Sukhāvatīvyūha,* might properly be thought of as cult products.[56] Thus we are reminded yet again how problematic it is to think of *the* Mahāyāna as anything like a single movement or tradition. It is entirely likely that some bodhisattva fraternities would have been just as uncomfortable with each other as they might have been with their Mainstream brethren.

The *Rāṣṭrapāla* strongly suggests that a state of high tension arose between its authors, presumably with their bodhisattva fraternity, and the local Mainstream establishment sufficient to inspire the former to extricate themselves—at least rhetorically—from what had become sedentary monasticism. Three important qualifications are necessary here.

First, it would be a mistake to take Mainstream Buddhism as a homogeneous institution. Many of our canonical texts suggest, and contemporary anthropology confirms, that Buddhist monasteries housed individuals of various aspirations. Some communities may well have remained untroubled by those askew from the mainstream. Others clearly were not. The experience of sectarian tension thus was subjective, and its articulation in our texts was no doubt motivated by a range of rhetorical strategies among our authors. It was not necessarily perceived by all Mahāyāna groups equally or in the same ways. And again, our Mahāyāna sources appear to confirm as much.

Second, the monastic authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* did not understand themselves literally to be leaving the "church." Everything about this text indicates that they understood themselves to be monks in the canonical sense—a sense that from their perspective was lost on their co-religionists.[57] But the bodhisattva fraternity represented by the *Rāṣṭrapāla* separated itself from permanent residence in the monastery because it was impossible in their view to live as a true monk otherwise.[58] Forest dwelling was the only viable expression of their calling in a de-

generate age. But if these forest monks had had no further dealings with their sedentary brethren, there would have been little reason for ongoing tension. We might hypothesize, therefore, that it was the very disciplinary obligations incumbent upon all monks, namely, to participate fortnightly in the *prātimokṣa* recitation and confession rites, that led to strained relations between different monastic factions who may have had little else in common. Thus it is only appropriate to talk about the *Rāṣṭrapāla* as a sectarian product at the level of intramonastic tension and factionalization. We do not, in other words, see here the development of an alternative organization of the *saṅgha,* but on the contrary, what can only be described as a strong advocacy for traditional disciplinary strictures.[59]

Third, although I have linked several Mahāyāna texts together here and elsewhere in my discussion, I do not wish to give the impression that they necessarily shared identical agendas or objects of criticism. In each case the author implicitly or explicitly places himself along two parallel but separate axes. The first relates to vocation and ranges, with little room for degrees, between two poles: lay and renunciant.[60] The other relates to the author's orientation of values and stretches, with considerable room for degree, between the secular and the ascetic. The authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla,* along with the *Kāśyapa-parivarta* and the *Ratnarāśi,* clearly directed their charges at fellow monastics whose values had strayed toward the secular. The *Ugraparipṛcchā,* by contrast, is situated in the household in the figure of the lay bodhisattva Ugra.[61] But its task is to draw Ugra increasingly toward ascetic values by demeaning every aspect of lay life, to the point where he eventually renounces the household and is ordained. In both cases the ideal is the renunciant who has embodied ascetic values. But the authors have rhetorically positioned themselves at different places along these continuums, presumably because they had to negotiate different relationships with both insiders (fellow bodhisattvas) and outsiders (*śrāvakayāna* monks), not to mention with lay patrons.

It is worth pointing out, by way of caveat, that lay attitudes toward wilderness-dwelling monks were by no means always positive. In the contemporary context, Jane Bunnag has indicated that attitudes toward forest dwellers among the Thai laity are often mixed at best:

> Thai attitudes to monks who choose not to live in orthodox fashion in a monastery are rather ambivalent; whilst it is true that some monks who lead the life of a hermit, living in isolated caves and forests, are highly revered, the *thudong bhikkhu* whose way of life ideally corresponds most closely to the mendicant ideal of the early Buddhists is regarded with great suspicion; not belonging to lay society, nor being properly integrated into a monastic community, *dhutanga* monks are frequently regarded as being on a par with tramps, beggars and other kinds of social derelicts. Laymen also fear that

> monks who are seen wandering over the country and are thus not clearly attached to any particular *wat* may not have been properly ordained, and may be laymen who have falsely assumed the yellow robe.[62]

Gregory Schopen has shown in the premodern context that monastic law codes reveal communities deeply concerned with social censure and the threats to monastic livelihood that such censure might precipitate.[63] It may well have been the case that local monastic opposition to a wilderness-dwelling faction of monks, as reported by the authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla,* could also have been motivated by objections from prominent lay donors, who, like their contemporary Thai counterparts, were also suspicious of irregular monks.

If we assume, along with at least some sociologists of religion, that one of the chief aims of religion is to supply supernatural compensators for material rewards that are scarce or unavailable within a given community, then we may begin to understand why patronage was such a central concern to the authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* and related texts. Insofar as some bodhisattva networks were in all probability outside of the typical spheres of power and influence, unable to attract independent donations or support, we would expect that they would be in the most conflict with their Mainstream brethren who enjoyed such benefits. As a result, it may be precisely the ascetic current within some Mahāyāna fraternities that eventually bolstered their credibility vis-à-vis Mainstream monastics.

Lay donors across religions are typically suspicious of affluent clergy, for, in the words of the Gospels, "they have already had their reward." Affluence undermines the establishment precisely because it places their motives in doubt, thereby making the compensators they offer to patrons less credible. Ironically, religious merit is inversely proportional to the successful acquisition of patronage, which ties the sedentary monastic to a web of secular and secularizing relationships, thereby diminishing the stature of the recipient as a genuine field of merit. This dialectic has been confirmed repeatedly by the anthropology of Buddhist monasticism in modern Thailand, Burma, Sri Lanka, and Tibet, and the entire history of Chinese Buddhism can be understood only through the prism of this tension.

But the credibility of forest monks as legitimate objects of patronage, that is, as supreme sources of merit, is secured only insofar as they themselves sublimated this strategy. In other words, their conspicuous nonconsumption had to be devoid of any sense of entitlement: "They [i.e., bodhisattvas] protect pure morality like a precious jewel; it does not occur to them: 'I am the one truly self-controlled in morality.' "[64] A number of early Mahāyāna *sūtra*s were all too aware that assuming the appearance of a wilderness dweller could elicit ample but undeserved rewards. I will note but one example, this time from the

Kāśyapa-parivarta. Here the Buddha describes four kinds of *śramaṇa*s, three of whom are ascetics in appearance only, while the fourth alone engages in correct practice. About the former the Buddha declares:

> Kāśyapa, a certain ascetic upholds the discipline, having calculated, "How may others know me to be an upholder of the discipline?" He preserves what he has learned, having calculated, "How may others know me to be very learned?" He lives in the wilderness, having calculated, "How may others know me to be a wilderness dweller?" Calculatingly, he dwells with few desires, satisfied and alone. But he acts merely to deceive others, not for the sake of cultivating aversion to the world, not for the sake of the destruction of lust . . . not for the sake of complete awakening . . . not for the sake of *nirvāṇa.* This, Kāśyapa, is called an ascetic interested in fame, renown, and celebrity.[65]

Early Mahāyāna authors recognized that the rigors of the wilderness dweller's pursuit and particularly his disdain for accruing personal wealth were likely to draw patrons toward him, thereby undermining the Mainstream monastic establishment they so vociferously criticized.[66] But this strategy is credible only when the forest dweller's motives are directed toward an alternative commodity, and for the authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla,* the future compensation for the bodhisattva's ascetic rigors, for his maintenance of strict morality in an age of decline, is the glorified body of a buddha, replete with the thirty-two auspicious marks of the superhuman.

A compensator is valuable, however, only insofar as its worth is recognized and reinforced within a given social network. This too accounts for the great concern expressed by Mahāyāna authors for threats from within. Much of the beginning of "The Story of Puṇyaraśmi" in the *Rāṣṭrapāla* is dedicated to exposing sham bodhisattvas, who, despite their supposed aspiration toward enlightenment, are in fact preoccupied with public reputation and fawning after family, friends, and donors: "Desirous of profit, [the corrupt bodhisattva] goes to the wilderness, but there he only seeks material gain[67] and frequents relatives."[68] Such hypocrites are said to be more reproachable than the six heretical teachers of the Buddha's time.[69] This is because the benefits offered to the ascetically inclined bodhisattva are viable only if they are a collectively produced commodity sustained in the face of a high-tension relationship with the Mainstream. Marginal groups can survive only if the average level of member commitment is high; they must, in effect, have a strategy for eliminating what sociologists call the "free-rider" problem.[70] Backsliding or dissembling by members of a marginal network calls its compensators into question and increases the perceived risks for those within the fold. Sects can seldom afford to tolerate such defections.

Some readers by this point may fear that I have reduced the wilderness-dwelling movement within the early Mahāyāna to a band of savvy monks bent on increasing their economic profile. But in fact, for these bodhisattva critics, it is precisely the status quo relationship between monks and the laity, a relationship founded on the exchange of material and symbolic commodities, that had become disordered.[71] Corrupt monks, from their point of view, were in the habit of coaxing undeserved patronage from unsuspecting donors, thereby depriving the latter of the full fruits of their investment. The wilderness-dwelling faction for their part sought to reestablish the mutually beneficial relationship between donors and proper fields of merit. Thus the *Rāṣṭrapāla* and like-minded texts were in part engaged in a fundamentally conservative agenda: the purification from the *saṅgha* of renunciants who had deceitfully undermined the foundations of this transaction. It bears mentioning, however, that we have no reason to believe that these bodhisattva fraternities were necessarily successful in their efforts.

This portrait of the early Mahāyāna, drawn primarily from the *Rāṣṭrapāla* and related texts, seems to indicate that this movement occupied the margins of the Indian Buddhist world. It would be interesting to determine whether additional evidence, external to its own literature, could confirm this portrait. In fact, I think such evidence exists and that it has been available for some time.

Gregory Schopen has noted that the epigraphical record of Indian Buddhism during the first half of the first millennium indicates that Mainstream monastic institutions were deeply imbedded within their socioeconomic milieux.[72] Donative inscriptions demonstrate time and again that the Mainstream orders were the recipients of regular and often extensive patronage from prominent lay, even royal, families. The record also indicates that, with only one clear exception, Mahāyāna fraternities nowhere show up as recipients of patronage before the fourth or fifth century, precisely the time when Mahāyāna influences appear conspicuously in the art historical record, for example, in the cave complexes at Ajaṇṭā.[73] This is precisely what we might expect if the Mahāyāna was in fact a fringe, often despised, sectarian movement unable to garner much in the way of public prestige. But there is yet another body of evidence that may further confirm these speculations.

Beginning in the mid-second century of the Common Era, Buddhist texts are translated for the first time into Chinese, most notably in the capital at Luoyang. With only a few exceptions, these translations are of Mahāyāna texts brought by Kushan, Parthian, and Sogdian emissaries. It may not be an accident that the majority of early missionaries to China are affiliated with the Mahāyāna if in fact China held out the prospect of a religious and economic haven many found lacking in their homelands. When the Mahāyāna does begin to appear on the scene in Indian Buddhist inscriptions, roughly around the

fourth or fifth century, the Mainstream schools increasingly cease to be found epigraphically as recipients of substantial patronage. And, as if to confirm this hypothesis, the first large compendia of Mainstream *āgama* and *vinaya* texts are translated in China at about the same time, suggesting the possibility of a reversal of fortunes between these groups.[74]

If this supposition is even partially correct, there is much about the motivations of the first translators in China that has quite probably been misunderstood. Indeed, many no doubt were moved by a desire to propagate the Dharma. But it may also be true that those who arrived in the first few centuries may have been as much refugees as missionaries. This possibility has a number of implications for the character of early Chinese Buddhism as well, in particular for our understanding of what conditions made Buddhism in China possible.

While many details have yet to be worked out on the nature of the Mahāyāna in both India and China, it is clear that nothing to date supports any presumption of a successful, early revolution by this movement. It was not the lay-centered reformation of monastic elitism still often described in our textbooks. Much of what we see in the literature suggests, to the contrary, that many Mahāyāna fraternities had to constantly combat internal and external pressures to maintain their identity. The cost to many members of this movement must have been great. The promised rewards, therefore, would have to have been greater still.

PART II

Indian Buddhism Through a Chinese Lens

Dharmarakṛa's Translation of the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā-sūtra*

CHAPTER FIVE

The Role of Translation in Reconstructing the Early Mahāyāna

> There are means by which the linguistic genius of a nation defends itself against what is foreign by cunningly stealing from it as much as possible.
>
> —Karl Vossler, *The Spirit of Language in Civilization*

Translation in the Indian Context

It would be impossible to exaggerate the importance of translation to the study of the world's religious literature. From the rendering of the Hebrew Bible into Greek to the King James Bible of seventeenth-century England, translation has been at the vanguard of religious transmission and transformation. The history of the transmission of Buddhism has also in many ways been the history of its translations. Regardless of which language the Buddha himself spoke, a source of ongoing scholarly debate, he certainly did not preach in any of the languages in which his purported sayings are preserved. Although not frequently brought to the fore, our corpus of Indian Buddhist texts—be they Pāli, Gāndhārī, or Sanskrit—is a corpus of translations.[1]

We are, moreover, dependent upon translations into non-Indian languages for much of our knowledge of Indian Buddhism. An adequate study of the Mahāyāna and Tantric traditions would be all but impossible without the extant collections of Chinese and Tibetan renderings of canonical works. The study of early Mainstream Buddhism has historically proceeded on the basis of the Pāli canon, the only complete Buddhist canon we possess in an Indian language. But this collection is the textual record of but a single Mainstream school, the Theravādins—in fact, a single sublineage of the Theravādins—whose scriptures were preserved in Sri Lanka and Southeast Asia after the demise of Buddhism in India.

The two Indian Buddhist groups, therefore, that have received the most scholarly attention, the Theravāda and the Mahāyāna, have received this attention precisely because their scriptures were available outside of India, in places where Buddhism continued to flourish. There is a certain irony here, however, in that

these two groups were by all appearances among the least influential for most of the history of Indian Buddhism.[2] On the basis of inscriptional records of donations to particular monastic orders as well as the accounts of Chinese pilgrims to India, we know that a number of other groups figured much more prominently. These would include the Sarvāstivādins, particularly in the north, the Kāśyapīyas, the Mahāsāṃghikas, together with their sublineages in the south, and the Sammatīyas, to name only a few.[3] The Sthaviravādins (Pāli: Theravādins) are little known on the subcontinent outside of Bodh-gayā, a site they seem to have largely monopolized, and the Mahāyāna does not appear on the ground until the fourth or fifth century, with one notable exception.[4] The fact that the texts—particularly the *āgama* and *vinaya*—of several of these other Mainstream lineages are preserved only in Chinese makes the study of these translations all the more important for correcting the current imbalance in our histories.

Indologists, moreover, have been drawn to the early Chinese translations as representatives of Mahāyāna *sūtra*s at a time thought to be rather close, by Indian standards, to that of their composition. These early translations predate our oldest Sanskrit manuscripts and earliest Tibetan translations by four or five centuries—often many more—and may well reveal an earlier redaction of the Indian textual tradition, our only window into the hazy origins of the Mahāyāna.[5]

The motive for investigating the earliest available versions of religious texts is obvious. Normative documents, perhaps more than any other body of literature, are continually susceptible to the impositions of a later orthodoxy. As some nascent ideas are tried out and rejected, others are accepted for various reasons, and the tradition becomes tracked in familiar, well-worn ruts. The historian always wants to know what the subsequent ecclesiastic often fears: could it have been otherwise? Under what conditions was the tradition pushed in some directions and not others? To know this we must discern what fodder was available to the early recruits—what was tried, what wasn't.

In addition, there is good reason to believe that these early Chinese translations may contain clues concerning the Indic language of transmission. Given that almost all of our extant Indic-language materials date from a period when Sanskritization had already profoundly reshaped their idiom, these early Chinese sources may be our only glimpse into their earlier Middle Indo-Āryan stage. In the following chapter, I will consider some of the evidence for this question from Dharmarakṣa's third-century translation of the *Rāṣṭrapāla*.

Translation in the Chinese Context

The Chinese translation of Indian Buddhist texts is perhaps the most astounding example of cross-cultural exchange in the ancient world. The vastness of the

divide—both geographic and cultural—that had to be traversed was daunting. Although emerging trade routes helped in surmounting the expanse of the Taklamakan desert, linguistic barriers proved to be more formidable. Sanskrit and Chinese could hardly be more heterogeneous. Sanskrit is a highly inflected language, written in an alpha-syllabic script,[6] with an elaborate, prescriptive grammar. Chinese, by contrast, is completely uninflected—in fact, uninflectable—morphosyllabic, and with little formal grammatical tradition.[7]

To complicate matters further, the first translators, be they Indians, Central Asians, or Chinese, were for the most part unprepared to bridge the gap between the two. Foreign missionaries seldom had command of the Chinese literary language and therefore tended to work closely with interested Chinese collaborators. The Chinese assistants for their part almost never attained mastery of any Indian language.[8] Kenneth Ch'en has characterized the difficulties aptly:

> In some cases, the foreign monk did not understand the written Chinese language and perhaps possessed only a smattering of the spoken tongue. The Chinese collaborator on his side was ignorant of the foreign language. The foreign monk would explain the text with his limited knowledge of the spoken tongue, but he had no idea what the Chinese was writing down. The latter merely wrote what he heard, but knew nothing of what was in the original text. Thus a yawning gap existed between the two; the foreign monk could not compare what the Chinese wrote against the original to test the accuracy of the translation, nor could the Chinese check his written words against the foreign language of the text. Room for misunderstanding was therefore present at every step.[9]

The resulting texts, as can be imagined, are fraught with more than a few difficulties. With the exception of a few brave Japanese scholars, students of both Indian and Chinese Buddhism have generally been put off by their difficult, if not at times, impenetrable idiom.

Be that as it may, these early translations are enjoying an upsurge of scholarly attention. Sinologists, led in the West by Erik Zürcher, have sought to mine these texts as rare repositories of early Chinese vernacular language.[10] The fundamentally oral/aural nature of the translation process in China, a process that I will discuss in some detail below, has left remnants of what looks to be the spoken idiom of north central China during the first few centuries of the Common Era. Moreover, these texts record a deep engagement with a truly foreign intellectual tradition for the first time in Chinese history. Shaped by teams outside of traditional literati circles, these translations may well provide clues re-

garding the extent to which a number of early medieval Chinese religious and philosophical ideas permeated a broader spectrum of society.

It is important to remember by way of caveat that the history of early Chinese Buddhism cannot simply be equated with the history of the translation of Indian Buddhist texts into Chinese. Without downplaying the importance of these texts to the growing number of literate lay—and eventually monastic—devotees, it would be a mistake to assume that Buddhism only, or perhaps even primarily, made its impact felt in China by way of its literature.[11] We know, for example, that already in the late Han, the veneration of the Buddha image was practiced at the court of Emperor Huan and that a military officer named Ze Rong 笮融 built large monasteries in Xuzhou (near modern Nanjing) at which reportedly thousands participated in "bathing of the Buddha" rites.[12] Translations treating such practices do not appear until much later. Clearly such devotional practices must have been part of an oral or imitative transmission by Indian or Central Asian Buddhists for which we have no other extant record.

It is the promise of these early translations that has drawn me to the corpus of the largely unstudied texts translated by the Yuezhi monk Dharmarakṣa in the late third century. Dharmarakṣa was born in approximately 233 at Dunhuang, a military and mercantile outpost at the farthest western reaches of the Chinese empire. He is the first we hear of Buddhism at this crossroads of international commerce. He is said to have studied there under an Indian teacher before beginning a translation career that would span forty years and see the rendering of over 150 texts into Chinese. Many of his translations were instant successes. They were copied and circulated in north China already in the late third century, and several became the focus of intense exegetical scrutiny by clerics of the fourth century.[13]

Despite the invitation to study that these texts seem to offer, the prospective fruits of such an undertaking are not necessarily apparent. The early Chinese translations are so fraught with problems that their value for Indian textual history has been seriously questioned.[14] From the Chinese side, it is obvious that these texts are not fundamentally creations of the Chinese religious milieu and thus cannot report directly upon it. On the surface, these documents appear to be frozen between two very different worlds, satisfying to specialists of neither. Any approach to examining these translations will require that we contend with the means by which the Indic texts—their exact language remains to be determined—were made accessible to interested Chinese. It is my contention that this can only be accomplished by considering in detail the records of the translation process itself as well as by an analysis of the resulting translation idiom. In the end, we must learn how to straddle both worlds in every act of reading, highlighting in turns the Indic and Chinese frames of reference simultaneously encoded in these translations.

Recent studies in translation theory have emphasized the need to view the text in situation, to see both the cultural context and intended reader as integral parts of the text itself.[15] Textual analysis from this perspective should proceed then from the macrostructure of the text to the microstructure of the word or phrase, seen not as isolated units, but for their relevance and function within the narrative frame. Such an approach would be more valuable for texts with fewer problems than are presented to us in Dharmarakṣa's corpus. Even a cursory reading of almost any one of his texts reveals that his translations—to the extent that they are "his"—often fluctuated wildly between close, literal renderings of the Indic text and loose paraphrases punctuated with Chinese literary allusions. My quest, then, is in part a search for the basic unit of linguistic transfer, that is, those cohesive segments that formed the basis of the reception of Dharmarakṣa's recitation-cum-gloss for his translation assistants. As we will see in this and the following chapter, there is nothing approaching consistency in this matter. In fact, it is the considerable number of mistakes in the translation—phonetic misconstruals, semantic interchanges, and syntactical misplacements—that highlight with greater precision the collaborative nature of these works and the likely roles of the various participants on the translation committees. Such a realization requires that we start from the bottom up, that we thoroughly dissect, where necessary, each line of translated text vis-à-vis its best Indian representative(s) to account for those translation anomalies that defy a more contextualized form of analysis.

My fundamental approach to Dharmarakṣa's translation of the *Rāṣṭrapāla,* then, is at once both straightforward and complex. What is the relationship between Dharmarakṣa's source text and the resulting translation? Do Dharmarakṣa and his assistants move the original toward the target language, making it seem familiar to native readers, or do they bring the target language into the world of the original, giving the translation a strangeness, a feel that perhaps charged it with an aura of exotica? For example, we might suppose that the propensity to translate rather than transcribe proper names and technical terms on the part of Dharmarakṣa—in notable contrast to the style of Lokakṣema of the late Han—reflects just such an attempt to render these foreign texts more accessible to Chinese converts. Such a strategy could be seen as a means to market these otherwise strangely hybrid, semiliterary productions to a growing clientele of avant-garde sympathizers.

It is my hope that an appreciation of the complexities faced in China during these first engagements with the Indian literary tradition will to some degree inform both sides. Richard Robinson, in his now classic study *Early Mādhyamaka in India and China,* unequivocally stated: "Chinese is capable of conveying all the significant lexical and structural meanings of a Sanskrit original."[16] In fact, he claims, many of the mistakes in the translations of Kumārajīva and others did not

have to occur. My examination in some sense attempts to take up this proposition again. When a Chinese translation fails to capture the original—or presumed original—then we naturally want to ask: what went wrong? An appreciation of these issues is a crucial first stage to using these documents for our larger historical questions.

The Translation Process

Although translation studies per se is quite a young field, there have been centuries of reflection—and despair—over the problems of moving from one language to another. Indeed, some literary theorists have questioned the validity of the enterprise itself.[17] Perhaps because of this ambivalence toward translation, there have been until recently few attempts to detail the process by which this movement takes place, the steps by which the idiom of one text with all its semantic and cultural baggage is mapped onto the target language.[18] Given the known limitations of those involved in translating Indian Buddhist texts into Chinese in the first few centuries of the Common Era, this problem should especially concern us. Thus we must begin with what is known about this process in China so as to frame more cogently the problems we encounter in Dharmarakṣa's *Rāṣṭrapāla.*

Our knowledge of early translation activity is furnished by a significant number of colophons, prefaces, and bibliographers' notices preserved most notably in Sengyou's *Chu sanzang ji ji* 出三藏記集 (A Collection of Notes on Rendering the Tripiṭaka) compiled in about the year 515. These early records provide a detailed, but by no means unambiguous, description of the roles of those who participated on the translation teams.[19] A thorough examination of these notices to the translations is a necessary preliminary to understanding the specific roles and contributions of the various members of these teams. And the results of such an analysis will bear directly on long-debated queries: the language of the source text, the real linguistic competence of the foreign missionaries, and the impact of the Chinese literati assistants in shaping these texts for the target audience.

Although no colophon to Dharmarakṣa's translation of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* is preserved in our extant catalogues,[20] we do have a record of the translation procedures for another text within Dharmarakṣa's corpus, the *Suvikrāntacintidevaputra-paripṛcchā,* completed approximately three and a half years before his translation of the *Rāṣṭrapāla.* The intrinsic interest of this colophon and the possible light it may shed on the only slightly later translation of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* merit its translation in full:

> *Xuzhen tianzi jing* 須真天子經 *[Suvikrāntacintidevaputra-paripṛcchā]:* On the eighth day of the eleventh month of the second year of the Taishi reign

> period [= December 21, 266],[21] at the White Horse Monastery[22] inside the Azure Gate in Chang'an,[23] the Indian bodhisattva Dharmarakṣa [*tanmoluocha* 曇摩羅察][24] orally conferred and rendered it [*kou shou chu zhi* 口授出之]. At that time the ones who transferred the words [*chuanyanzhe* 傳言者] were An Wenhui and Bo Yuanxin. The ones who took it down in writing [lit. "received it by hand"][25] were Nie Chengyuan, Zhang Xuanbo, and Sun Xiuda.[26] It was completed on the thirtieth day of the twelfth month[27] during the second watch of the afternoon [*weishi* 未時 = 1–3 p.m.].[28]

Several important issues are raised by this colophon. First, Dharmarakṣa is described as "orally conferring and rendering" the Indian text. The record does not tell us whether he held an actual manuscript in his hands or recited the text from memory. Colophons to other translations, for example, to those of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra,* the *Avaivartikacakra-sūtra,* and the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra,* state explicitly that Dharmarakṣa held an Indic text in his hands and conferred a recitation of it upon a scribal assistant. Although it can not be proven in the case of the *Suvikrāntacintidevaputra-paripṛcchā-sūtra,* I presume that here too Dharmarakṣa worked from an actual Indic manuscript. We will see evidence in the following chapter that Dharmarakṣa may have misread some *kharoṣṭhī* letters in his manuscript of the *Rāṣṭrapāla,* indicating once again that he was not working from memory.

The crucial word for understanding Dharmarakṣa's role on this committee is *chu* 出, a very common yet difficult to pin down verb frequently used in such records. It is often translated as "to publish," but that makes little sense in the ancient context and does nothing to clarify the designated activity. Arthur Waley has argued that *chu* refers to an oral translation as opposed to *yi* 譯, a written one.[29] Since all translations by Indian and Central Asian missionaries were carried out orally, there appears little point to such a contrast. Arthur Link has gone further to suggest that *chu* is "an abbreviation for the technical Buddhist compound *i-ch'u* [譯出]. . . . That is *i-ch'u* means 'translated [with the result that a book] is issued,' or more simply, 'translate.' "[30] Richard Robinson contends that *chu* at least sometimes refers to the recitation of the Indic text, not its translation into Chinese; he cites several examples.[31] Robert Shih seems in part to support this position: "Dans les préfaces, la différence entre 'publier' et 'traduire' apparaît clairement. Celui qui tient en mains le texte indien joue un rôle plus important que celui qui traduit l'indien en chinois."[32] While the authority of the foreign master was acknowledged by the Chinese bibliographers, we will see data that calls their actual competence into question, at least without substantial qualification. None of these positions is fully satisfying. To "render" an Indian text is to bring it out of its native guise, to make it available to the other members of the translation com-

mittee.[33] This certainly must have involved a recitation of the manuscript, as Robinson contends. It is also likely to have included at least some kind of preliminary exegesis as well. But I seriously doubt that *chu* can be thought of as "to translate" in the way that we now use the term.

The colophon additionally informs us that Dharmarakṣa was assisted by two collaborators, the Parthian An Wenhui and the Kuchean Bo Yuanxin,[34] who "transferred the words." The scenario presented in this record then seems clear: it is they who listened to Dharmarakṣa's recitation of the Indic text and presumably converted their understanding of his recitation into vernacular Chinese for the Chinese scribes, while conferring, we assume, with Dharmarakṣa concerning the precise meaning of many words and phrases. These are the individuals, then, who we would normally take to be the real translators.[35]

Finally, the colophon tells us that three individuals, all presumably native Chinese, shared in the task of "receiving by hand" the oral rendering of the bilingual intermediaries. This task must have involved some kind of conversion of the oral draft translation of the Parthian and Kuchean assistants into the semiliterary text that has come down to us. It may also be the case that these scribes would have contributed in important ways to the substance of the translation, both in their own limited apprehensions of Dharmarakṣa's recitation of the Indic text as well as by interpolating native Chinese understandings of Buddhist technical terms.[36]

Colophons to other translations indicate that Dharmarakṣa's skills in Chinese would remain questionable for many years to come, necessitating his reliance on translation assistants from India, Central Asia, and China. Evidence for this comes from the next dated colophon we have from within Dharmarakṣa's corpus, namely, that for the *Yogācārabhūmi-sūtra,* translated in 284:

> The Gandhāran[37] scholar Zhu Houzheng—whose nature is pure and generous, who takes pleasure in the Way and is dedicated to the Venerable One [i.e., the Buddha], whose fondness for study does not tire, truly a superior scholar—brought the text of this *sūtra* to Dunhuang. At that time the Yuezhi bodhisattva *śramaṇa* Dharmarakṣa—who is pure in virtue and broad in knowledge, whose discernment is like a deep pool, whose aspiration is to convert the not-yet-advanced, who teaches men according to the truth, who is fully accomplished in Indian languages and is also conversant in Chinese—he [and Zhu Houzheng] met each other here [in Dunhuang] and expounded [*yan* 演] it together. Their scribes [*bishouzhe* 筆受者] were the bodhisattva, disciple, and *śramaṇa* Fasheng and the Yuezhi Fabao. The esteemed Li Ying, Rong Cheng, Suo Wuzi, Yan Chishi, Tong Wu, Zhi Jin, Zhi Jinbao, and so forth—more than thirty men in all—together encouraged and assisted [the work, i.e., served as patrons].[38]

> On the twenty-third day of the second month of the fifth year of the Taikang reign period [= March 26, 284] [the translation] was finally completed. Those who copied the text in standard script[39] were Rong Xiye and Hou Wuying. This *sūtra* is from beginning to end twenty-seven chapters long;[40] it is divided into six fascicles approaching 60,000 words. Then the assembled worthies each distributed it.[41]

Dharmarakṣa may have developed his Chinese skills during the "blank period" in his standard biography, roughly the years 273 to 284—before his translation of the *Yogācārabhūmi-sūtra* and during which time we hear nothing of any translation activity.[42] Nevertheless, despite the colophon writer's claim that Dharmarakṣa "is fully accomplished in Indian languages and is also conversant in Chinese," he was not yet fully prepared to translate alone. With his translation of the *Yogācārabhūmi-sūtra,* the first translation we can date after his so-called mountain seclusion, Dharmarakṣa is said to have expounded (*yan* 演) this text in conjunction with Zhu Houzheng of northwest Indian provenance. While "expound" here must include something of the notion of translation, it is again interesting that this exposition was not described by a verb more precisely denoting interlinguistic transfer. It suggests on the surface something more like an explanation of the text. In fact, a more detailed analysis of the translation idiom of many of Dharmarakṣa's texts reveals what looks like a series of piecemeal decipherments and glosses, often little guided by context, as we will see below.[43]

Only with the colophon to the *Avaivartikacakra-sūtra,* dated eight months after the translation of the *Yogācārabhūmi-sūtra,* do we first find an explicit statement of Dharmarakṣa orally explaining a text in Chinese on his own, although again here the verb chosen, *fu* 敷 ('promulgate'), carries no sense of transference between languages. From this point on we can assume that Dharmarakṣa himself controls the recitation of the Indic text and makes a version of its Chinese exegesis available to one or more assistants.[44]

The next substantial record of Dharmarakṣa's translation activity is the colophon to his translation of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra.* I have discussed this colophon elsewhere,[45] but because of its considerable relevance to my argument here, I will cite it again in full:

> On the tenth day of the eighth month of the seventh year of the Taikang reign period [= September 15, 286 C.E.], the Yuezhi bodhisattva *śramaṇa* from Dunhuang Dharmarakṣa, holding the *kharoṣṭhī* [*hu* 胡][46] scripture in his hand, orally delivered and rendered[47] the twenty-seven chapters of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra,* conferring it upon the *upāsaka*s Nie Chengyuan, Zhang Shiming, and Zhang Zhongzheng, who together took

> it down in writing. Zhu Decheng, Zhu Wensheng, Yan Weibo, Xu Wencheng, Zhao Shuchu, Zhang Wenlong, Chen Changxuan, and others all took pleasure in encouraging and assisting. It was finished on the second day of the ninth month [= October 6]. The Indian *śramaṇa* Zhu Li and the Kuchean householder Bo Yuanxin both collated [*canjiao* 參校] the translation. On the sixth day of the second month of the first year,[48] it was reexamined. Furthermore, on the fifteenth day of the fourth month of the first year of the Yuankang reign period [= May 29, 291 C.E.], Sun Bohu of Chang'an copied it with simple glosses.[49]

A number of points from this colophon deserve further discussion. This translation, like many in Dharmarakṣa's corpus, was very much an international affair. No fewer than thirteen participants are mentioned by name, and these include Chinese,[50] an Indian, a Tokharian, as well as, of course, the Yuezhi Dharmarakṣa. We can only imagine what a hodgepodge of linguistic backgrounds such a variety of assistants would have brought to the translation process. They almost certainly would have had a diverse range of skills in Indian languages, and, perhaps more important, as we will see below, they would have had an equally diverse range of pronunciation habits.

What is most important about this colophon, however, is what it reveals of the actual steps of the translation process. First, it is explicitly stated that Dharmarakṣa held a manuscript in his hands. Dharmarakṣa is the first translator in China who is clearly reported to have held an actual manuscript during the translation, although we should be cautious in attaching too much significance to what may be a simple omission of detail. Dharmarakṣa is then said to have "orally delivered and rendered" the whole of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka,* conferring the text upon the *upāsaka* Nie Chengyuan and two other scribal assistants.[51] I take this to mean that Dharmarakṣa conveyed a recitation of the Indic text to his scribes, along with a preliminary series of glosses, and that they, not Dharmarakṣa, then converted the oral draft translation into literary Chinese, influenced as well by their apprehension of the Indic recitation.

Exactly what transpired between the recitation of the Indic text and the creation of the literary Chinese translation cannot be known with certainty. But it is clear that we cannot take for granted the polyglot skills attributed to Dharmarakṣa by the Chinese hagiographers. These preserved colophons suggest something of an evolution in his Chinese ability. In the colophon to his earliest recorded translation, the *Suvikrāntacintidevaputra-paripṛcchā,* it is clear that Dharmarakṣa was not able independently to translate the Indian text into Chinese. Later in his career, however, the colophons state explicitly that he "held the foreign text in his hand and orally delivered it into Chinese" (*kouxuan jinyan* 口宣晉言).[52] The

"translator" of the *Lotus Sūtra* is by comparison more difficult to discern. It is easy to imagine that Dharmarakṣa, despite having attained considerably improved skill in Chinese over the course of twenty years of translation work, would still have been unable to translate the text on his own. He would in all likelihood have contributed considerably to his assistants' understanding of the text, adding exegetical comments as well as his own suggestions about appropriate renderings. Nevertheless, much of the translation was shaped, I suspect, by Chinese who were almost certainly not fully qualified in the Indic languages.[53] And evidence from the translation itself appears to confirm this.[54]

The colophon also tells us that quite a number of individuals "encouraged and assisted" in the translation. We would expect that those so named were the most generous patrons of the translation work. The translation was proofread by an Indian monk and a Kuchean layman—a Kuchean who, as we saw above, had experience with Dharmarakṣa before. This combination of disparate nationalities and Buddhist "ranks" in what should have been an important conclusion to the translation is perhaps not as unusual as it might seem, given the generally multiethnic character of Dharmarakṣa's cohorts at Dunhuang and Chang'an. But it should again be borne in mind that whereas the translation of the Indic text may have been substantially shaped by Chinese assistants, the Chinese translation is here checked by an Indian and a Tokharian.

Given the evidence, then, that Dharmarakṣa's Chinese skills would have been quite limited in the earliest period of his translation career, precisely the time when he translated the *Rāṣṭrapāla,* we might expect that the process of translation involved a difficult oral/aural interaction between Dharmarakṣa and his collaborators. For example, some of the anomalies we find in his translation could have resulted from mishearings of Dharmarakṣa's recitation of the Indic text by members of his team. Consider the following verse, the first in Dharmarakṣa's translation:

RP 8.14–15: *bodhisattvacaryā suniścitā tattvato bhavati yo 'sya saṃbhavaḥ / jñānasāgarakathā viniścayaṃ bhāṣatāṃ mama jino narottamā //*
(May the Victor, the Most Excellent of Men, relate to me a disquisition, a discourse containing an ocean of knowledge, on the well-determined bodhisattva career that has its origin in truth.)

Dh 412a.19–20: 云何菩薩滿所行 何謂所作而審諦
具足智慧功德願 今人中尊解說是
(How does the bodhisattva fulfill the practice, which is

[well] accomplished and fully known, replete with wisdom and meritorious aspirations? [May] the Most Honored among Men today explain it.)

Dharmarakṣa's translation of this verse departs in manifold ways from our extant Sanskrit text. The single term I would like to highlight here, however, is Dharmarakṣa's rendering of -*sāgara*- ('ocean') as *juzu* 具足 ('accomplished, replete'). To explain this incongruity, at least two scenarios are possible. First, if Dharmarakṣa's Indic manuscript was indeed written in *kharoṣṭhī* script as I will attempt to demonstrate in the following chapter, then we might expect that this same manuscript would have been derived from a Gāndhārī Prakrit–using environment. Under such circumstances, Dharmarakṣa's Indic text could have had -*saghara*- in place of -*sāgara*-, reflecting the weakening of the distinction between aspirated and unaspirated intervocalic consonants in Gāndhārī Prakrit, not to mention the general loss of marked long vowels.[55] The word *saghara* is well attested in the Khotan *Dharmapada* as an equivalent for *saṃskāra*.[56] And we know from elsewhere in the translation of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* that Dharmarakṣa's team used *juzu* to render *saṃskṛta, saṃskāra* ('completed, accomplishment').[57] It is also possible that the Indic manuscript had, in fact, our attested -*sāgara*- but that the translation assistants misheard Dharmarakṣa's recitation of the word as the Gāndhārī -*saghara*- (= *saṃskāra*) and conveyed such an understanding to the Chinese scribes. This would have been especially understandable if these translation assistants had encountered the word *sagara/saghara* in other contexts with the meaning of *saṃskāra*.

An example of an even more likely oral/aural confusion occurs in "The Story of Puṇyaraśmi":

RP 47.13–14: *gajapatigatigāmī siṃhavikrāntagāmī*
vṛṣabhalalitagāmī indrayaṣṭipravṛddhaḥ /
gaganakusumavṛṣṭiḥ puṣpachattrā bhavanti vrajati-m-anuvrajanti dharma ete 'dbhutasya //
(Sauntering with the gait of the lord of elephants, with the strides of a lion, and with the grace of a bull, he is mighty as [the *nāga*] Indrayaṣṭi. A rain of flowers from the sky becomes parasols of flowers; when he walks, they follow him. These are his marvelous qualities.)

Dh 417a.2–5: 經行如龍王 為如師子步 行時默低頭 諸根悉清淨
若人散花者 變成為花蓋 有增無減時 是為佛正法
(He walks along like the king of *nāga*s, making strides

> like a lion. When he walks, he lowers his head with reserve; all of his faculties are pure. Should one strew flowers upon him, they would be transformed into a flower parasol. When there is increase without decrease [?], this is the True Dharma of the Buddha.)

There are a number of problems with Dharmarakṣa's rendering that are not immediately solvable. For our purposes here, I only want to call attention to the last five-character unit, "this is the True Dharma of the Buddha," clearly responding to the Sanskrit *dharma ete 'dbhutasya.* It is possible here that Dharmarakṣa's translation assistants aurally misconstrued *'dbhutasya* as *buddhasya. Bhūta* and *buddha* are confused elsewhere in Dharmarakṣa's oeuvre.[58] But it is highly unlikely that they could have been confusable to Dharmarakṣa, even if his manuscript were composed with considerable Middle Indo-Āryan influence. While *bhūta* is known to appear, for example, in Gāndhārī Prakrit as *bhuda,*[59] we would not expect the forms of these two words to have coalesced in this language or in any other Indian language. But it is entirely conceivable that the scribal assistants could have failed to distinguish aspirated and unaspirated stops when they were unable to discern a more contextualized understanding of the text. Apparently they were also unaided by Dharmarakṣa himself, who may not have been prepared to offer assistance yet from the Chinese side. At the very least we can appreciate the difficulties encountered by these early translators as they attempted to decipher texts reflecting an already mixed linguistic heritage, in all probability composed, transcribed, and edited across multiple regions, using different hybrids of Middle Indo-Āryan and Sanskrit languages.

If we have seen ways in which oral/aural confusions could have crept into the finished translation, we should also consider the possibility that the Chinese scribes might have attempted to accommodate third-century Chinese sensibilities from their end. This would be all the more likely given that these scribes were ultimately responsible for the shape of the literary Chinese text, as indicated in the colophons. For example, in "The Story of Puṇyaraśmi" Dharmarakṣa's committee renders *apsarasas* ('celestial nymph') as *yunü* 玉女 ('jade maiden'), a term that typically referred to a class of female divinities in China at least since the late Warring States period in such texts as the *Chuci.* By the late Han and Northern and Southern Dynasties periods, the term was co-opted in Daoist circles to refer to chaste female transcendents charged with reporting an individual's transgressions to the celestial bureaucracy. These same figures in later, especially Shangqing, circles often served as guardians of revealed Daoist scriptures.[60] Clearly Dharmarakṣa's collaborators, the same ones who may have struggled to understand his Indic recitation, were willing and able to draw from the contemporary Chinese religious idiom, an ability we

have reason to suspect Dharmarakṣa himself lacked at this early juncture in his translation career.

Another example of a culturally responsive translation that occurs repeatedly in Dharmarakṣa's *Rāṣṭrapāla* is the binome *xianju* 閑居 ('dwelling idly') within passages calling for bodhisattvas to dwell in the wilderness *(araṇya).*[61] Although this binome is not unique to Dharmarakṣa's translations, being known already from his predecessors, it is clear from the Chinese side that the expression *xianju* has strong associations with the antinomian reclusion so often praised in the poems and essays of such third-century literati as Xi Kang, Ruan Ji, and other members of the famous Seven Sages of the Bamboo Grove.[62] By using *xianju* to refer to forest asceticism, the Chinese scribes on Dharmarakṣa's translation committee aligned, perhaps only subtly, the *Rāṣṭrapāla* with this third-century rhetoric. And while such a translation would have effectively resonated with an interested Chinese reader of the late third century, it is doubtful that it would have equally conveyed the sense intended by the Indian text. What would have been a call to the intense discipline of the homeless ascetic to an Indian reader is in the Chinese text made to look like the carefree wandering of the *Zhuangzi,* the Daoist classic read with renewed enthusiasm during the third century.

We can see clearly then that Dharmarakṣa was by no means solely responsible for "his" translations. He was, we can safely assume, responsible for making the Indian text available to his translation committee. But it was the Chinese scribes who took down the translation into a semiliterary Chinese. What occurred between these two steps must have been a complex process of gloss, commentary, and some bad guesses.

What we learn by starting with the most basic units of linguistic transfer and by unpacking the process by which these texts were produced is that no one-to-one correspondence between the underlying Indic text and the extant Chinese translation can ever be assumed. This means that students of Indian Buddhism will have to proceed with a greater sensitivity to the production of these translations in China. What may be most profitable and interesting about these early Chinese translations is not the degree to which they accord with our extant Sanskrit texts, but, in fact, the ways in which they seem to miss the mark. It is the mistakes after all that force us to ask new questions about the translation context. But it is also the case that some kinds of historical inquiries are illuminated more brightly by just such kinds of translation anomalies. They can in some cases provide concrete, even virtually certain, evidence of the underlying Indic script and language. And this data will go a long way toward filling out our picture of Indian Buddhist canons now long lost to us in their originals.

CHAPTER SIX

Mistranslation and Missed Translation

> "When I use a word," Humpty Dumpty said in a rather scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less." "The question is," said Alice, "whether you can make words mean so many different things." "The question is," said Humpty Dumpty, "which is to be master—that's all."
>
> —Lewis Caroll, *Through the Looking Glass*

In Chapters 1 through 4 I have attempted to recover the disguised forms of exchange represented in the fully elaborated version of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* as it has come down to us in the extant Sanskrit redaction as well as in the Tibetan and the two later Chinese translations. My goal was to lay bare the socioreligious milieu of a subgenre of early Mahāyāna *sūtra* literature as it influenced the Indian authors and editors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla.* In this chapter I will want to consider its earliest Chinese translation, the third-century rendering by Dharmarakṣa, particularly for what it can reveal about the history of this text over time. This will allow us to place developments tentatively within at least one textual tradition in a time frame more circumscribed than is usually possible with our Indian sources. In addition, I will seek to explicate some of the difficulties that the third-century translators encountered, since it is the translation anomalies that promise to shed the most light on the nature of the earliest source text known to us. In doing so, I will also call into question the many attempts to locate the Mahāyāna and its textual witnesses on the basis of linguistic data alone.

Dharmarakṣa's Source Text and the "Gāndhārī Hypothesis"

The severe paucity of early Indian manuscripts has forced us to rely for the most part on very late Nepalese Sanskrit sources for our knowledge of Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism. Even our Tibetan translations do not date generally be-

fore the ninth century. One of the great values of the early Chinese translations, therefore, is their capacity to inform us about the early shape of their Indic sources as well as the language of their underlying Indian manuscripts. This section will address the second of these issues first.

There is a widely held assumption, championed most vigorously by John Brough over forty years ago, that the vast majority of early Chinese Buddhist translations were rendered from Indic originals composed in Gāndhārī Prakrit, a language that flourished in northwest India, eastern Afghanistan, and parts of the Tarim Basin during roughly the first half of the first millennium. Since Brough, this assumption has been repeated numerous times, often with no additional support, generating what I have elsewhere termed the "Gāndhārī hypothesis."[1] Much of this hypothesis is founded on the seeming similarity between the reconstructed pronunciations of Chinese transcriptions of Indic locutions and the Middle Indo-Āryan language previously known only from the Khotan *Dharmapada* and miscellaneous inscriptions from Greater Gandhāra.[2] We now have many more Gāndhārī Prakrit texts in *kharoṣṭhī* script at our disposal than even a decade ago, and recent work on the early Chinese translations suggests that it is time to reconsider this hypothesis in greater detail.

In light of the complexity of determining the relationship between the Indic source text and the pronunciation habits of Central Asian and Chinese translators, I have opted here for a different, more limited approach. I will attempt to show instead that some confusions in the earliest Chinese rendering of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* may constitute evidence for Dharmarakṣa's misreading of his Indic manuscript. The kinds of misreadings I have in mind cannot be described as free or loose interpretations of the original. That is to say, these are instances where Dharmarakṣa's translation departs from our extant Sanskrit and Tibetan versions in ways that are neither predictable nor in most cases even sensible. And the nature of these misreadings may be directly related to the underlying language and script of his Indic source text.

The first example is drawn from the middle of the "Prologue" in a set of verses recapitulating the ways in which a bodhisattva may purify his course toward enlightenment:

RP 16.15–16: *pratipadati yathā ca bodhimārge sa tu pariśodhayate sadāśayaṃ ca / dhāraṇīpratilābham eṣamāṇaḥ sahati ca duḥkhasatāṃ guṇābhikāṅkṣī //*
(As [the bodhisattva] undertakes the path toward enlightenment, he always purifies his intent. Seeking the acquisition of *dhāraṇī,* he desires virtue and endures hundreds of afflictions.)

Dh 413a.5–6: 假使得佛覺道意 常為清淨無疑難
總持辯才<u>一其心</u> 忍一切苦不想報
(If [the bodhisattva] obtains the aspiration for enlightenment, he will always be pure, without doubts or difficulties. With *dhāraṇī*s and eloquence he unifies his mind and endures all miseries without thinking of recompense.)

One immediately notices a number of problems in Dharmarakṣa's rendering here, not all of which are easily explainable. The phrase I would like to call to attention is *dhāraṇīpratilābham eṣamāṇaḥ,* "seeking the acquisition of *dhāraṇī*s," rendered by Dharmarakṣa as "with *dhāraṇī*s and eloquence he unifies his mind." First, it would appear that Dharmarakṣa's Indic manuscript read *-pratibhānam,* "eloquence," or as Graeme MacQueen terms it, "inspired speech," instead of *pratilābham.*[3] Dharmarakṣa's reading, moreover, is confirmed by Jñānagupta's translation and by the Tibetan.[4] More problematic, however, is Dharmarakṣa's misconstrual of *eṣamāṇaḥ,* a present middle participle, as if it were *eka-manas,* "of one mind, concentrated." Certainly these two words are not semantically confusable, but if we assume Dharmarakṣa to have been reading a *kharoṣṭhī* manuscript, then it is not impossible that he could have confused a later form of the letter *ka* in this script with the letter *ṣa.* This would have been especially likely if his *ka* resembled the form found on such inscriptions as the Wardak Vase and in some of the recently discovered *kharoṣṭhī* manuscripts held in British Library.[5] Such a misreading obviously wreaks havoc with the resulting translation.

A second example is drawn from early in "The Story of Puṇyaraśmi," where the faults of those who claim to follow the bodhisattva career are enumerated at length. The Buddha contrasts these shortcomings with his own exertion and heroic sacrifices during former lives. To illustrate his former commitment to the Dharma, the Buddha declares:

RP 36.11: *mahāprapātaṃ jvalitaṃ <u>hutāśanaṃ</u> subhāṣitārthe patito 'smi pūrve / śrutvā ca tasmin pratipattiye sthito vihāya sarvāṇi priyāpriyāṇi //*
(Formerly I threw myself into a great abyss, ablaze and on fire, for the sake of the well-spoken [Dharma]. After listening to it, I was established in good conduct, relinquishing all that is dear and despised.)

Dh 414a.4: 有大燈明<u>無能見</u> 我本求索善義說
適聞所教即奉行 斷絕一切諸愛欲

> (There was a great illumination that could not be seen *[sic!];* I formerly sought the superb and righteous doctrine. Just as I heard the teaching, so I put it into practice, cutting off all desires.)

Clearly Dharmarakṣa did not see the first *pāda* as the object of the verb *patito 'smi* (I fell). This may have contributed to his misreading *hutāśanaṃ,* literally "oblation-eater," thus "fire," as *wuneng jian* 無能見 (could not be seen). If Dharmarakṣa was unfamiliar with this Indian metaphor, it is not inconceivable that he could have read the initial *hu*- in a *kharoṣṭhī* manuscript as *a-,* which, with a normal Prakritic voicing of the intervocalic dental, would have led him to recite the text as *a-da(r)śanaṃ* (invisible).[6]

In a final example, also from the beginning of "The Story of Puṇyaraśmi," the Buddha elucidates the karmic consequences that indolent, conceited monks can expect:

RP 35.19–20: <u>*apāya*</u>*bhūmiṃ gatim akṣaṇeṣu daridratāṃ nīcakulopapattim / jātyandhadaurbalyam athālpasthāmatāṃ gṛhṇanti te mānavaśeṇa mūḍhāḥ //*
(These fools, on account of their arrogance, will be subject to an evil state, a destiny among inopportune rebirths, poverty, and rebirth in a lowly family; they will be blind from birth and ugly,[7] having little strength.)

Dh 413c.21–22: <u>不見</u>道住隨亂行 生於貧窮卑賤家
在醜惡中無力勢 墮於貢高愚癡地
(Not seeing the stage of enlightenment, they follow corrupt practices and are born in a poor and lowly family, into an ugly state, without strength. They fall on account of their conceit to the level of stupidity.)

Once again there are several syntactical problems that make Dharmarakṣa's rendering difficult to understand. I will only note the possibility that the initial *apāya*- may have been read as *apaś(y)a-,* "not seeing," given the very close graphic similarity between late forms of the *kharoṣṭhī ya* and *śa.* These letters in fact are often nearly indistinguishable in records dating from the beginning of the Common Era.[8] There are other examples elsewhere in this text as well as in other translations by Dharmarakṣa that exhibit this same confusion between *ya* and *śa.*[9]

These examples are by no means unambiguous, but they do demonstrate that Dharmarakṣa had great difficulties in reading his manuscript of the

Rāṣṭrapāla. We are not dealing here with true textual variants, although certainly Dharmarakṣa's Indic text looked quite different from the Sanskrit version that has come down to us. The great value, however, of such mistakes in a Chinese translation is that they virtually insure very specific readings in the source text. In other words, it is when a confusion could only have taken place between two visually confusable graphs or, in other cases, orally confusable phonemes that we may be quite certain as to what Dharmarakṣa had before him. Passages like those cited above strongly suggest that a number of the translation infelicities within Dharmarakṣa's translation can best be explained as misreadings of a *kharoṣṭhī* manuscript. That such mistakes remained in the finished work suggests that no member of the translation team was in a position to check both the Indian text and the literary rendering of the Chinese scribes, confirming our suspicions of the linguistic limitations of Dharmarakṣa and his collaborators.

The supposition of a *kharoṣṭhī* source text, however, requires some immediate caveats. First, evidence for an underlying manuscript in *kharoṣṭhī* script, despite its predominant role for conveying the Gāndhārī language, is not necessarily evidence for an Indic text in Gāndhārī Prakrit, as has been presumed by some scholars. It is entirely possible, as I have suggested elsewhere, that a Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit manuscript could have been transmitted in *kharoṣṭhī* script, as evidenced by Niya documents 510, 511, and 523 as well as by fragments brought to light more recently from the Pelliot and Schøyen collections.[10] Nevertheless, we might expect a text in *kharoṣṭhī* script to have been transmitted from or through a Gāndhārī-using environment and therefore to exhibit influence from that Middle Indo-Āryan language, regardless of the original idiom of its composition. For example, the following translation anomaly in Dharmarakṣa's *Rāṣṭrapāla* might be explained as a misunderstanding of Gāndhārī phonology:

RP 35.15–16: *daridrabhūtāś ca hi pravrajitvā dāridryamuktā samavāpya pūjāṃ | taiḥ <u>kāñcano</u> bhāra-m-ivāpaviddhaḥ sasasya bhāraḥ punar udgṛhītaḥ* ||
([These corrupt bodhisattvas] went forth from the household on account of being poor but were freed from poverty only so as to obtain homage. It's like they threw away gold as a burden only to take up a load of grain.)

Dh 413c.17–18: 生於貧家作沙門　在窮厄中求供養
譬如<u>有人</u>窮無物　從他債望求財產
(Born into a poor family, they become *śramaṇa*s. In the midst of hardship, they seek homage. Like some-

> one who is poor, without property, they hope for
> wealth through a loan from someone else.)

It is clear that Dharmarakṣa and his committee did not understand the second line of this verse. One of the words that appears to have confounded them is *kāñcano* ('gold'), which Dharmarakṣa renders as "someone" (*youren* 有人). This confusion would be easier to account for if Dharmarakṣa's Indic manuscript, which we now have good reason to believe was written in *kharoṣṭhī* script, was also influenced by the Gāndhārī tendency toward assimilation of nasal plus consonant to consonant alone, with or without voicing (e.g., *ñc* > *j* as in *paja* < *pañca*).[11] If so, it is possible that this word could have appeared to him as **kajano* (Skt. *ko janaḥ*), "what person," or **kacano* (Skt. *kaścana*), "someone." Needless to say, his committee failed to take better advantage of context to discern the most likely meaning here.[12]

In one more example, the following translation anomaly is probably an even clearer case of a misunderstanding of a Gāndhārī locution:

RP 35.11–12: *asaṃyatā uddhata unnatāś ca agauravā mānina lobha utsadā | kleśābhibhūtāḥ sakhilāḥ sakiṃcanāḥ sudūra te tādṛśa agrabodhaye* ||
('Unbridled, haughty, proud, disrespectful, arrogant, abounding in avarice, overcome with defilements, callous, and attached to property—very far indeed are such persons from highest enlightenment.')

Dh 413c.13–14: 無智憒亂為放逸　輕慢無敬多貪求
與塵垢會起欲想　是輩之人去道遠
('Without knowledge, disconcerted, without restraint, inconsiderate, without respect, greatly avaricious, they meet with defilements as they give rise to thoughts of desire—such persons are far from enlightenment.')

Although Dharmarakṣa's translation matches the Sanskrit rather closely, he unexpectedly renders *asaṃyatā* ('unbridled') as *wuzhi* 無智 ('without knowledge'). Assuming his Indic manuscript was written with considerable Gāndhārī influence, as is likely the case, then his text may have read *asañada* here for *asaṃyatā*, a form we find attested in the Khotan *Dharmapada*.[13] If that is the case, it would have been possible that Dharmarakṣa or assistants on his translation committee misunderstood *asañada* as derived from *asaṃjñāta* ('not known, understood'). This is only speculative, though it fits the known data well.

With a new body of Gandhāran texts at our disposal—the recently acquired British Library *kharoṣṭhī* manuscripts, the Senior manuscripts, the newly found Bajaur manuscripts from Pakistan, and *kharoṣṭhī* fragments within the Schøyen and Pelliot collections—we no longer must rely on supposition or speculation to posit the existence of a canon of Buddhist scriptures in Gāndhārī Prakrit. We now possess *sūtra*s from a putative *Dīrghāgama,* a *Madhyamāgama,* a *Samyuktāgama,* and an *Ekottarikāgama.* We also have a miscellany of texts from a collection paralleling the Pāli *Khuddaka-nikāya,* including selected verses from a *Sutta-nipāta,* another partial version of the *Dharmapada,* some *avadāna* texts of a decidedly local character, and evidence of a *Sthaviragāthā.* In addition, we have some fragments in the British Library collection of the *Abhidharma* genre. Most recently, *kharoṣṭhī* texts have come to light from Bajaur that provide our first Gandhāran manuscript evidence for the *vinaya* and of a Mahāyāna *sūtra.*[14]

The lack of a substantial body of Mahāyāna *sūtra*s in Gāndhārī Prakrit, however, says nothing about the presence or absence of this movement in Greater Gandhāra. If the Mahāyāna was first situated in small subfraternities within larger Mainstream monasteries as I have hypothesized in Chapter 4, then this may explain why their texts generally were not well represented in monastic libraries in the earliest period, at least in the Northwest. That some of the early Chinese translations, including Dharmarakṣa's translation of the *Rāṣṭrapāla,* were rendered from originals in *kharoṣṭhī* script does strongly suggest that these manuscripts were transmitted from this region, whether or not they were originally composed there. It does not, however, indicate that the Mahāyāna flourished in Kushan territories.[15] We would do well to remember that the two bodies of scholarly evidence made available most recently—the new finds of Gāndhārī literature and the research on the source texts of the early Chinese translations—both speak to the situation of Buddhism in Gandhāra, but not in parallel ways.[16]

So while we can more or less confidently assert that Dharmarakṣa's Indic source text was written in *kharoṣṭhī* script, we cannot definitively prove that the earliest version of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* was composed in the region of Greater Gandhāra. All we know is that this text circulated, before it reached China, in a *kharoṣṭhī* script-using environment and that it appears to have been influenced in the process by the linguistic peculiarities of the Gāndhārī language, as we would expect. In other words, this evidence does not genuinely address the still contentious question of the geographical origins of the Mahāyāna, a question that continues to attract significant scholarly attention. But it does point to the possibility that its earliest visible success was found only on the fringes of the Indian Buddhist world and beyond.

Dharmarakṣa's Translation and the Evolution of the Indic Text

The composition of Dharmarakṣa's translation differs significantly from our extant Sanskrit manuscripts, Tibetan translation, and later Chinese translations. There are numerous passages and whole sections in the fully elaborated text that have no parallel in his third-century translation. These missing sections can be charted in outline as follows (references are to page and line of Finot's edition):

Chapter 1

I. 1.7–4.19 (eulogy of the Buddha)
II. 5.7–8.6 (Rāṣṭrapāla's verses in praise of the Buddha)
III. 10.10–11.2, 11.6–17, 12.4–15, 13.4–15, 14.2–12, 15.1–8, 17.7–17, 18.6–16, 19.4–15, 20.1–10, 20.16–21.8 (verses recapitulating the various fourfold sets of bodhisattva qualities)
IV. 21.9–27.18 (allusions to fifty *jātaka*)
V. 28.1–33.6 (reproaches of corrupt *bhikṣu*s)

Chapter 2

VI. 37.13–39.7 (verses by Śuddhāvāsakāyika gods to Puṇyaraśmi)
VII. 50.7–53.18 (verses by Puṇyaraśmi eulogizing the Buddha Siddhārthabuddhi)
VIII. 54.12–56.2 (verses by King Arciṣmat eulogizing Siddhārthabuddhi)

Missing sections of the "Prologue" include stanzas eulogizing the body of the Buddha, verses recapitulating prose descriptions of the virtues and pitfalls of the bodhisattva career, a large set of verses detailing the Buddha's heroic efforts as a bodhisattva during fifty of his former lives, and a section containing the most strident reproaches of monastic corruption. Missing from "The Story of Puṇyaraśmi" are three sets of verse: the first by the Śuddhāvāsakāyika deities, who impress upon the young Puṇyaraśmi the proper attitudes of one on the bodhisattva path; the second is a eulogy by Puṇyaraśmi on the glories of the Buddha Siddhārthabuddhi's body; and the third is a similar eulogy to this buddha by King Arciṣmat.[17] In all, approximately 50 percent of our extant Sanskrit recension is not represented in our earliest Chinese translation. Most noticeably omitted are some 248 of 353 verses, reminding us that the often assumed historical priority of metrical sections in Mahāyāna *sūtra*s may need to be qualified.[18]

Many of the strongest criticisms of the Sanskrit text—invective aimed at arrogant and greedy monks who usher in the imminent destruction of the Dharma—are missing, giving Dharmarakṣa's version of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* a decid-

edly less caustic tone. However, it is worth pointing out that the author's strong criticisms of his fellow bodhisattvas at the beginning of "The Story of Puṇyaraśmi" are included in Dharmarakṣa's third-century translation. As I argued in Chapter 4, dissatisfaction with insiders is typically of far more serious concern for marginal religious networks than complaints about those outside the fold. We can still confidently assert that the Indic text available to Dharmarakṣa was decidedly proforest, that it embraced the reinvigorated discipline of wilderness dwelling I charted in Chapter 3. But it would also appear that the overall strategy of the fully elaborated text was not part of Dharmarakṣa's Indic source. That is to say, we see no clear signs of the *jātaka* narratives that stand out prominently in the Sanskrit "Prologue," and much of the emphasis on the glorified body of the Buddha is also missing. Therefore, the intimate relationship I argued for between the Buddha's former exertions and his building of a perfected body replete with the thirty-two marks of the superhuman must be understood to apply to the somewhat later, more developed text. The Indic text underlying Dharmarakṣa's translation would appear then to represent something of a frame on which the warp of the eulogies for the Buddha's glorified body was interwoven with the woof of references to his former exertions as the wilderness faction of a later Mahāyāna fraternity bolstered its claims for authority and made a place for itself in a contentious socioreligious environment.

With Jñānagupta's Chinese translation of the late sixth century, the *Rāṣṭrapāla* undergoes far fewer changes by the time of its ninth-century Tibetan translation, its late tenth-century Chinese translation by Dānapāla, and its much later Nepalese Sanskrit manuscripts.[19] The crucial period, then, for understanding significant developments in the history of the text can be placed roughly between 270 and 550 C.E., corresponding approximately to the north Indian Gupta period. We might expect that a subsequent editor of the *Rāṣṭrapāla*, the same one, in all probability, who identified himself in verses 172–173 of the "Prologue" as having incredulous teachers, made at least some of the augmentations to the text during this period. This is an important piece of data. It tells us, for instance, that long after the Mahāyāna had appeared on the Indian Buddhist scene, its fraternities were still the object of considerable hostility, at least in some quarters. But we also know that it was during this same period that Mahāyāna monks—as well as lay brothers and lay sisters—appear independently for the first time in Indian inscriptions. We might speculate then that if the Mahāyāna fraternity with which this later editor was associated had begun to make its presence felt in increasingly public ways, the resistance from the Mainstream, who may well have perceived a threat to their status, could have intensified accordingly. This state of affairs may also help explain the vitriolic response of the later editor, whose scathing critiques of his fellow monks stand out sharply.

At the very least, we know that the *Rāṣṭrapāla* was made to respond to multiple contexts over time. Clearly the bodhisattva networks that composed, circulated, and later augmented the text of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* had great difficulty settling into a comfortable coexistence with their Mainstream confrères, and these difficulties continued, if not worsened, between the third and sixth centuries.

PART III

An Annotated Translation of the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā-sūtra*

The Questions of Rāṣṭrapāla

One: Prologue

[1] Homage to all buddhas, bodhisattvas, noble *śrāvaka*s and *pratyekabuddha*s![1]

> Listen respectfully to this *sūtra,* the *Rāṣṭrapāla,* a bridge over the stream of existence, an ancient, meritorious, and noble course—complete and true—in which the Lord of the Sages made clearly manifest[2] that winding stairway to the great heaven, which is the abode of the Well-Accomplished One, the most excellent accomplishment in the Triple World, studded with a variety of luminous jewels of the True Dharma.[3]

[Opening]

Thus have I heard at one time[4] when the Blessed One *[bhagavan]* was dwelling in Rājagṛha on Vulture's Peak Mountain, together with a great assembly of 1,250 monks and 5,000 bodhisattvas,[5] all of whom possessed eloquence free of attachment, obtained tolerance, subdued the enemy Māra,[6] who have become very close to all buddha qualities,[7] who are bound to only one more rebirth,[8] who have obtained *dhāraṇī*s, obtained the concentrations,[9] obtained unlimited eloquence, obtained confidence free of attachment,[10] who have attained control and supreme mastery over supernatural powers . . . [11] and who have mastered the complete mass[12] of virtues. The bodhisattvas present included the following: the bodhisattva *mahāsattva* Samantabhadra, the bodhisattva *mahāsattva* Samantanetra, Samantāvalokita, Samantaraśmi, Samantaprabha, Uttaramati, Vardhamānamati, Anantamati, Vipulamati, [2] Akṣayamati, Dharaṇīṃdhara, Jagatīṃdhara, Jayamati, Viśeṣamati, and the bodhisattva *mahāsattva* Dhāraṇīśvararāja. Also gathered and seated in this very assembly were sixty persons of matchless minds headed by Mañjuśrī; the sixteen good men led by Bhadrapāla; Brahmā, lord of the Sahā world; Śakra, lord of the gods; the four world-guardians; the *devaputra* Susīma; the *devaputra* Susthitamati; and all the lords of the gods, lords of the *nāga*s, lords of the *kinnara*s, lords of the *gandharva*s, lords of the *yakṣa*s, lords of the *asura*s, lords of the *garuḍa*s, each with hundreds of thousands of manifold attendents.

Then the Blessed One, seated on the Śrīgarbha-studded[13] lion's seat, rose up like Mt. Meru from the multitude of the entire assembly, illuminating the whole world like the sun; illuminating the entire earth like the moon; delighting in tranquility like Brahmā; his body[14] difficult to encounter like Śakra's; like a *cakravartin* king, he is endowed with the seven precious substances, which are the constituents of enlightenment;[15] like a lion, he announces that all things are without substratum and are empty;[16] he makes the whole world shine like a multitude of fires,[17] blazing fiercely like the king of jewels among a mass of gems that have the luster of all the gods; he brightly radiates over the entire trichiliomegachiliocosm;[18] with great resolution[19] and having attained supreme mastery of all qualities,[20] he taught the Dharma in the midst of the assembly with a sound booming like Brahmā's voice and with an utterance adapted to the instruction of all sentient beings. He made manifest the best course,[21] which is good in the beginning, good in the middle, good in the end, good in spirit and in letter, unadulterated, complete, pure, and thoroughly purified.

[The Glorification of the Buddha]

At that time the bodhisattva *mahāsattva* named Prāmodyarāja was seated in attendence at this assembly. Seeing the Blessed One on the lion's throne—exceedingly radiant, obscuring the entire assembly with a brilliance surpassing a thousand suns—he was enraptured and delighted, and, with a heart overcome with faith, arose from his seat and with hands cupped together praised the Blessed One with these verses:

> "The Victor *[jina],* possessed of magnificent splendor[22] like a golden mountain, shines on the *śrāvaka*s and sons of the Buddha [i.e., the bodhisattvas],[23] overwhelming the world and this company of gods, *asura*s, *kinnara*s, and *nāga*s. (1)
>
> [3] "Shining like Meru, a dwelling for the host of gods even in the middle of the ocean, he emits hundreds of thousands of rays of light standing in the middle of an ocean of compassion. (2)
>
> "And this Superlative One [Brahmā] who has attained the supreme mental attitudes[24] shone[25] like one superior to Brahmā; this Most Excellent Being,[26] who delights in meditation, liberation, and concentration, shines over the whole world. (3)

"Possessed of great brilliance, shining in the midst of the gods like Śakra in the heaven of the thirty[-three gods], the King of the Sages, adorned with the marks and rich in gnosis[27] and virtues, shines over the whole world. (4)

"Radiant and resplendent,[28] this King of the Four Continents shines throughout the world; he whose mind is intent on compassion[29] shines while urging the world on the noble path. (5)

"He shines like the sun passing through the sky, overshadowing the light of a sunstone *[agnimaṇi];* this solar-Buddha *[buddharavi],* whose light surpasses a thousand suns, shines here over the world. (6)

"Stainless, he is as luminous as the moon at midnight; pure, he shines over the whole world. The countenance of the Victor, resembling the full moon, gleams forth beyond all splendor. (7)

"As a fire on the summit of a mountain illuminates everything[30] in the stillness of night, the radiance of the Great Seer's[31] gnosis also shines forth, completely dispelling the darkness of delusion. (8)

"Just as a lion, roaring in a mountain cave, frightens prey here in the world, so too does the Lord of Men, resounding that [all things] are empty and without substratum,[32] frighten those adhering to heretical schools.[33] (9)

[4] "Like the superb king of jewels, whose glorious brilliance outshines all gems, the body of the Victor, resembling the color of gold, outshines the whole world. (10)

"There is no being equal to you anywhere in the world, nor is any found to be superior to you. There is no one equal to you in merit, gnosis, heroic exertion *[vīrya],* or stratagems *[upāya]*—nor in any of your qualities. (11)

"I see this Champion of Men shining over the world, an ocean of virtues, a Protector. Full of respect and with welled up joy, I fall at the feet of the Victor. (12)

"May the whole world attain the highest enlightenment by the merit I have procured from praising him who is possessed of an intellect that is an ocean of compassion,[34] the source of all virtues, a lamp for the world." (13)

Then the bodhisattva *mahāsattva* Pramodyarāja, having praised the Blessed One with these verses, cupped his hands together in salutation and beheld the Realized One's body *[tathāgatakāya]* with unblinking eyes, reflecting only upon the dharma-realm, penetrating what is deep, difficult to fathom, difficult to see, difficult to understand, incomprehensible, beyond reason, tranquil, and subtle. Meditating upon the inconceivable domain of the buddhas and reflecting upon the gnosis of the Realized One, which extends over the entire dharma-realm, he surveys the unequaled domain of the buddhas, comprehending the inconceivable domain belonging to the Realized One's stratagems. Putting trust in the buddhas', the blessed ones' comprehension of the principle and inherent nature of the dharma-realm, seeing that the buddhas, the blessed ones have domains that are without foundation like the sky, he is fully committed to comprehending the inherent nature of all things as having no end as their true end *[bhūtakoṭi].* Desiring the liberation of the buddhas that is free from obstruction and comprehending the body of the buddhas, the blessed ones, to be unchanging, auspicious, and eternal, he comprehends the body of the Realized One as extending through all buddha-fields and as directed toward all sentient beings. He calls to mind that, even in millions of future aeons, there is no limit to the virtues of the buddhas, the blessed ones. The bodhisattva *mahāsattva* Pramodyarāja remained silent, pondering only the dharma-realm.

[Rāṣṭrapāla Enters Rājagṛha and Praises the Buddha]

At that time the venerable Rāṣṭrapāla[35] **visited Śrāvastī for the three-month rainy season. With the passing of the rains retreat [5] and provided with robes, he took up his bowl and robe, and together with the monastic assembly, including novices who had not long been renunciants,**[36] **he traveled the circuit of districts in an orderly fashion, going toward the great city of Rājagṛha** and the king of mountains, **Vulture's Peak.**

Then the venerable Rāṣṭrapāla approached the Blessed One, bowed his head at the feet of the Blessed One, and circumambulating him three times, **stood to one side.**[37] Standing to one side, the venerable Rāṣṭrapāla cupped his hands together in salutation and praised the Blessed One with these verses:

> "We honor the Most Excellent of Men, the Illuminator; we honor him whose mind is like the sky [i.e., limitless]. We honor the Victor who cuts away doubt; we honor the Sage who goes beyond the three realms of existence. (14)

> "The Guides *[nāyaka]* from a great many millions of [buddha-]fields universally sing your praises. When the sons of the Buddha hear this, they are ecstatic and go to you in order to worship the Sage, an ocean of virtues.[38] (15)

"Performing worship as is fitting for a Well-Accomplished One *[sugata]* and listening to the unsullied Dharma of the Great Sage, they go back to their own [buddha-]fields with gladdened hearts, singing of your string of qualities. (16)

"Seeking the highest, most excellent enlightenment, the unchanging course, over inconceivably many billions of millions[39] of aeons for the sake of sentient beings, your mind was never exhausted. (17)

"You practiced generosity and moral restraint, Leader, and were trained in tolerance, heroic exertion, and meditation. You always attained supremacy in wisdom and stratagems;[40] on account of this, I honor the Great Trainer.[41] (18)

"We honor him who is skilled in the [four] bases of psychic powers[42] and the most excellent supernormal capacities, who is trained in the spiritual faculties, powers, and the [approaches to] release, who is adept in training all sentient beings, and who has mastered unparalleled gnosis. (19)

[6] "You know the stream of thoughts of the world, what is their course of conduct, and how it results from their karma. You know, Blessed One, Highest of Men, by means of which method[43] the world is liberated. (20)

"And you know the good and bad actions in the world—those produced by passion and sin and having their origin in delusion,[44] by which sentient beings go to the three evil states, and those actions by which they go to a pleasant destiny. (21)

"You know all of the Well-Accomplished Ones of the past, who acted for the benefit of the world, and those of the present, who are worshiped by gods and men,[45] and those of the future who have mastered the most excellent of virtues. (22)

"You thoroughly recognize in every way their pure [buddha-]fields and excellent retinues,[46] their assemblies of bodhisattvas, as well as their *śrāvaka*s,[47] not to mention the extent of the lifespan of these Great Seers. (23)

" 'What sort of Dharma will continue to exist after your *nirvāṇa;* what sort of worship [will be rendered] for the Victor's relics; and of what sort then will be those who preserve the treasury of the Dharma'—all these, you know, Highest of Men. (24)

"The well-known, unconcealed gnosis of the one who Possesses the Ten Powers [i.e., the Buddha] continues to exist always in the three times [i.e., past, present, and future]. Homage to you, Ocean of Wisdom, the Victor, whose thoughts do not cling to any thing.[48] (25)

"There is no one equal, much less superior, to you, whose body is adorned with the marks like the sky dotted with stars. We pay homage to the Best of Sages, the Highest among Men. (26)

"Even your corporeal form,[49] which is pleasing to the mind, is unequaled; it eclipses the world together with the gods. In your presence, Brahmā, Śakra, and the Akaniṣṭha gods[50] are not the least resplendent.[51] (27)

"You are stainless, like a mountain of gold; your unctuous, delicate hair turns clockwise on your head. Your cranial protuberance[52] rises like Meru, the king [of mountains], and shines as a result of your extensive merit. (28)

[7] "Emitting billions of millions of light rays, your *ūrṇa* shines on the ridge of your eyebrows. The eye with which you, intent on compassion, see the world is lovely as a lotus. (29)

"Your face, Trainer, shines like the full moon in the bright sky; people who see you cannot be satiated. We pay homage to the Highest among Men, endowed with a beautiful face. (30)

"You walk over the surface of the earth, causing it to tremble, with the gait of a goose, a peacock, a lion, with the sauntering stride of an elephant in rut. We pay homage to the one Possessed of the Ten Powers, whose religious observance is firm. (31)

"The fingers of your hand are beautifully long and round, with pure, copper-colored fingernails and adorned with webbing in between. When you stand up, [your hands] reach your kneecaps. We pay homage to him who resembles the color of gold. (32)

"You walk on the surface of the earth, adorning it with footprints inlaid with wheels and webbing. Human beings who were matured by the light rays emanating from your feet[53] go to the world of the gods when they die. (33)

"King of the Dharma, Provider of Sevenfold [spiritual] Treasures,[54] Benefactor of the Dharma, he whose mind is tamed, teaching the world through

actions having to do with the Dharma[55]—I bow before the Master of the Dharma, the Guide. (34)

"The armor of benevolence,[56] the supreme sword of mindfulness, the bow of morality, and the arrows of wisdom and stratagems are the means by which the *kleśa*-enemies, which increase the craving for birth, death, and existence, are subdued.[57] (35)

"As one who has crossed over, you rescue millions of sentient beings; liberated, you liberate the world from its fetters. You show the path that is serene and without affliction, by which the Well-Accomplished Ones go to final liberation *[śivaṃ padaṃ].* (36)

"Endowed with compassion, you teach that unconditioned, most excellent emancipation where there is neither birth nor death, deprivation, nor any source of suffering. (37)

"May the world be awakened by whatever merit I have procured here by praising the Most Excellent of the World, the Great Sage, the Victor who has mastered all qualities." (38)

[Rāṣṭrapāla's Questions]

[8] Then the venerable Rāṣṭrapāla, having praised the Blessed One with these verses, cupped his hands together in salutation, rose from his seat, put his upper robe over one shoulder, and placed his right knee on the ground. Bowing toward the Blessed One with hands in salutation, he said to the Blessed One: "May I ask[58] the Blessed One, the Realized One, the Arhat, the Complete and Perfectly Enlightened One for some elucidation, if the Blessed One would grant me the favor to answer questions that I pose?" After Rāṣṭrapāla had so spoken, the Blessed One said to the venerable Rāṣṭrapāla: "Ask, Rāṣṭrapāla, whatever you want, and I will settle your mind with an answer to the very question about which you inquired."

After the Buddha had so spoken, **the venerable Rāṣṭrapāla said the following to the Blessed One: "With which qualities**, Blessed One, **is a bodhisattva *mahāsattva* endowed who obtains the excellence of all qualities[59] and virtues and obtains gnosis not dependent on another;[60] who attains direct insight and obtains eloquence in philosophical exegesis *[viniścaya];* who obtains illumination and penetration into omniscience, [the ability to] mature sentient beings, freedom from uncertainty, freedom from doubt, and the ascertainment *[viniścaya]* of omniscience; who attains skillfulness in fathoming sentient beings and acts as he says he will;**

who attains true, allusive speech[61] and skillfulness in dealing with sentient beings;[62] who obtains the mindful recollection of the Buddha[63] and the capacity for investigating all questions; and who attains the capacity to remember the entire Dharma and who quickly gains omniscience?" Then the venerable Rāṣṭrapāla at that time spoke these verses:

> **"May the Victor, the Most Excellent of Men, relate to me a disquisition, a discourse containing an ocean of knowledge,[64] on the well-determined bodhisattva career that has its origin in truth. (39)**
>
> **"You are the Highest, Most Excellent of Beings, like a body of purified gold, an accumulation of merit, a shelter and place of rest, a refuge. Tell me now about the highest, stainless course.[65] (40)**
>
> **"How does one obtain[66] the imperishable gnosis from which come forth the *dhāraṇī*, the deathless state [i.e., nirvāṇa],[67] and enlightenment? How is the ocean of wisdom purified by which doubt in men is cut off? (41)**
>
> **[9] "Transmigrating for very many millions of aeons, not even the notion of lassitude is ever produced. Beholding the world afflicted with suffering, [the Buddha] cultivates merit for their sake. (42)**
>
> **"Describe your pure [buddha-]field, your excellent retinue, your foremost long life, and your excellent field, as well as the unsurpassed discourse for the sake of sentient beings[68] and the stainless course toward enlightenment. (43)**
>
> **"For one who destroys Māra, corrects heterodox views, ends craving, and experiences liberation, the way of the Dharma[69] is also not confused. Proclaim, Jewel among Beings, the highest course. (44)**
>
> **"You who are blessed with beauty, prosperity, and eloquence, Well-Accomplished One, also make known the domain of the buddhas while gratifying the assemblies with your tender voice and satisfying the world like a rain cloud. (45)**
>
> **"Your lovely voice, like the sweet song of the cuckoo, like the voice of Brahmā, destroys vile thoughts. An assembly who desires the Dharma is gathered; gladden them, Lord, with your nectar. (46)**

"They have a desire for the highest, most excellent enlightenment, a desire for the Dharma that ought not to be rejected.[70] This is the time for a teaching,[71] Guide; this is the time for a proclamation,[72] Highest Jewel. (47)

"I have a longing for enlightenment, Sage; you know my intentions, Victor.[73] I do not wish to vex the Victor; please illuminate the highest course."[74] (48)

After Rāṣṭrapāla had so spoken, **the Blessed One said to him: "Excellent, excellent, Rāṣṭrapāla**; right indeed you are, [10] Rāṣṭrapāla, **that you should think the Realized One should be queried for this purpose. For the benefit of many people, Rāṣṭrapāla, have you acted, and for the pleasure of many people and for the sake and benefit of gods and men, and for the accomplishment of bodhisattvas** mahāsattvas **in the present and in the future. Therefore, Rāṣṭrapāla, listen carefully and think on this well; I will speak." "Excellent, Blessed One," assented the venerable Rāṣṭrapāla to the Blessed One. The Blessed One said the following to him:**

[The Qualities of Bodhisattvas]

"A bodhisattva *mahāsattva,* **Rāṣṭrapāla, who is endowed with four things obtains purity. With which four? With behavior in accord with [virtuous] inclinations and aspirations;[75] with equanimity toward all sentient beings; by contemplation of emptiness; and by acting as one says one will. Endowed with these four things, Rāṣṭrapāla, a bodhisattva** *mahāsattva* **obtains purity.** This is the universal rule concerning this."[76] About this the following is said:[77]

"Those who possess infinite gnosis—who are always zealous, and whose minds are not liable to turn back from the path toward enlightenment—have neither guile, nor callousness, nor deceit. (49)

"Seeing sentient beings afflicted and unhappy,[78] tormented by birth, sickness, old age, and death, they [i.e., the bodhisattvas] prepare a boat of the Dharma in order to ferry the world over the ocean of existence.[79] (50)

"The mild-mannered *[sūratā],* who possess equanimity toward all sentient beings, behold the world like an only son: 'I will liberate them all'—such is the intention of the highest men. (51)

"Always adept in [the various kinds of] emptiness,[80] [they know that] neither 'self' nor 'being' exists. The conditioned is like a dream or an illusion; the foolish, unawakened ones are confused concerning this.[81] (52)

[11] "The wise abide in practice as they say in words. Always tame and tranquil, the sons of the Victor [i.e., the bodhisattvas] have relinquished vice and are devoted to the path toward enlightenment." (53)

"**These four things, Rāṣṭrapāla, are encouragements for bodhisattvas. Which four? The obtaining of *dhāraṇī*,[82] the obtaining of virtuous friends, the obtaining of tolerance for the profound Dharma,[83] and the obtaining of the practice of pure moral conduct. These four things**, Rāṣṭrapāla, are encouragements for bodhisattvas. This is the universal rule concerning this." About this the following is said:

"Those of great renown [i.e., the bodhisattvas] always acquire *dhāraṇī* by which they preserve the most excellent Dharma spoken by all buddhas.[84] They never cause it to disappear, but rather, their determination[85] increases all the more. Gnosis is free of attachment for those who are accomplished in all qualities. (54)

"Those who reinforce the limbs of enlightenment obtain a virtuous friend. They teach him the most excellent path by which the Guides journey. In no instance are they followers of corrupting friends. From afar they shun like fire those who cause others torment. (55)

"When the resolute[86] hear the profound Dharma connected with emptiness, they have in no way any wrong views concerning 'self,' 'being,' or 'life-principle.' Their conduct is free of defect, their minds tranquil and tamed. They would enjoin those sentient beings toward the unexcelled conduct of the Buddha." (56)

"There are four things, Rāṣṭrapāla, that cause joy for bodhisattvas stuck in *saṃsāra*. What are the four? [12] Seeing the Buddha,[87] Rāṣṭrapāla, is something that causes joy for bodhisattvas. **Hearing the Dharma adapted [to their capacities]**, Rāṣṭrapāla, is something that causes joy for bodhisattvas, as are **renouncing one's entire property and tolerance of the inconceivable Dharma.[88] These four things**, Rāṣṭrapāla, cause joy for bodhisattvas stuck in *saṃsāra*. This is the universal rule concerning this." About this the following is said:

"They see in every lifetime[89] the Perfectly Enlightened One, the Highest of Men, who shines everywhere over the whole world with brilliance. Those committed to affection and respect thus worshiped the Lord of Men[90] when they were seeking the highest, supreme enlightenment for the sake of the liberation of sentient beings. (57)

"The resolute man listens to the tranquil and well-suited Dharma of the Guides and, after hearing it, applies himself to it earnestly and thoroughly. Hearing the inconceivable Dharma,[91] no doubt arises for him that all these things[92] are without 'being' and nothing called 'self' is found. (58)

"He who relinquishes all property, never laying hold of anything,[93] is glad to see a beggar approach. He renounces everything—village, kingdom, land, son, wife, and life—but his heart never[94] feels any vacillation."[95] (59)

"A bodhisattva, Rāṣṭrapāla, should be indifferent to four things. Toward which four? A bodhisattva should be indifferent, Rāṣṭrapāla, to living in the household. Having gone forth, Rāṣṭrapāla, a bodhisattva should be [13] indifferent to profit and honor.[96] A bodhisattva should be indifferent, Rāṣṭrapāla, to fraternizing with upper-class patrons.[97] A bodhisattva should be indifferent, Rāṣṭrapāla, to body and life.[98] Toward these four things, Rāṣṭrapāla, a bodhisattva should be indifferent. This is the universal rule concerning this." About this the following is said:[99]

"Having renounced the household, an endless thicket of sin, [bodhisattvas] are always indifferent to wealth.[100] Virtuous, tranquil in spiritual faculties, and mild-mannered, they take pleasure in the wilderness.[101] They are never intimate with women[102] or with men; they dwell alone like a rhinoceros,[103] stainless and with pure intentions. (60)

"They feel no joy[104] in profit, nor are they despondent on account of loss. Having few desires and taking pleasure in anything at all, they have rejected trickery and hypocrisy.[105] Their minds are disciplined in heroic exertion and they are committed to giving and self-control for the sake of sentient beings. They have achieved mastery in meditation and in the virtues stemming from their heroic exertion, for they are desirous of the gnosis of the Perfectly Enlightened One. (61)

"Being indifferent to both body and life, and having renounced their close relatives, they always discipline themselves on the path toward enlighten-

ment, extremely steadfast, with a determination like diamond. Even were their bodies cut into pieces, their minds would not waver. Even more then will those who are extremely steadfast, who desire omniscience, hold fast here to their heroic exertion." (62)

"These four things, Rāṣṭrapāla, cause bodhisattvas to be without regret.[106] Which four? Not violating moral conduct, Rāṣṭrapāla, is something that causes bodhisattvas to be without regret. **Not abandoning residence in the wilderness,[107] complying with the four traditions of the spiritually ennobled,[108] and obtaining deep erudition**, Rāṣṭrapāla, are things that cause bodhisattvas to be without regret. [14] **These four things**, Rāṣṭrapāla, cause bodhisattvas to be without regret.[109] This is the universal rule concerning this." About this the following is said:

"They [i.e., bodhisattvas] protect pure morality like a precious jewel; it does not occur to them: 'I am the one truly self-controlled in morality.'[110] They always encourage sentient beings who are endeavoring to gain the highest morality of the Buddha in this very morality. (63)

"They dwell in a desolute albeit pleasant[111] wilderness and have no conception of 'self' or 'life-principle.' They see all forms[112] as like a blade of grass, a stick, or a wattle-and-daub wall[113]—for them there is no 'woman,' nor 'man,' nor anything related to oneself. (64)

"Delighting in the four traditions of the spiritually ennobled and being without deception, guile, or lasciviousness, [the bodhisattva] exerts himself earnestly. He always strives for erudition and virtues, ardently seeking the authority *[mahānubhāva]*[114] of the Well-Accomplished One's gnosis.[115] (65)

"Beholding this world in the stream of existence,[116] without a protector, afflicted with birth, old age, death, and sorrow, oppressed by disease, [the bodhisattvas] rescue[117] humankind from the flood of the ocean of existence by preparing the most excellent and auspicious boat of the Dharma. (66)

"There is not any shelter, nor any refuge, nor any resort from error for the world in the conditioned state. 'I must liberate every single sentient being'—this is the reason for my vow toward highest enlightenment."[118] (67)

"**These four noble deportments,[119] Rāṣṭrapāla, are to be imitated by the bodhisattva. Which four? His obtaining of a good destiny by meet-**

ing with the appearance of a buddha, his obedience to his teacher by service free of worldliness, his taking pleasure in lodging (lit. "beds and seats") in secluded hinterlands[120] on account of his indifference to profit and honor, and his obtaining of eloquence by his being endowed with a tolerance for the profound Dharma.[121] These four, Rāṣṭrapāla, are the noble deportments to be imitated. This is the universal rule concerning this." About this the following is said:

> [15] "The resolute always dwell in forests and caves; they are never desirous of profit. They always possess eloquence and an intelligence free of attachment; conversant in the profound Dharma, their conceptual proliferation[122] has ceased. (68)[123]
>
> "Always obedient to their teachers, they have always acted as they said they would. They please unlimited numbers of Well-Accomplished Ones, and they perform extensive worship for the sake of the gnosis of the Victor. (69)
>
> "This is the best destiny for those of great renown[124] [i.e., the bodhisattvas]; they have attained supremacy among gods and men. They always incite[125] sentient beings onto the path toward perfect enlightenment as well as direct them toward the ten meritorious actions.[126] (70)
>
> "They become pleased when they hear about the virtues of the Buddha, [thinking], 'It will not be long before I obtain them.' And they will awaken to the auspicious, stainless, highest enlightenment, [thinking], 'I will liberate[127] billions of sentient beings from endless suffering.' " (71)

"These four things, Rāṣṭrapāla, purify the course toward enlightenment for bodhisattvas. Which four? The bodhisattva course for one who is not separated from unobstructed discernment;[128] living in the wilderness for one who has rejected hypocrisy, boasting, and extortion [of gifts from laymen]; the nonexpectation of reward for one who renounces all property; and desiring the Dharma day and night, they do not seek out the shortcomings of Dharma-preachers. These, Rāṣṭrapāla, **are the four things that purify the course of the bodhisattva for bodhisattvas." Then the Blessed One at that time spoke these verses:**

> **"Without hardness of heart, impurity, or angry thoughts, [the bodhisattva] does not seek out anyone else's fault. He is without deceit-**

fulness or hypocrisy, and his thoughts are free of conceptual proliferation as he desires to obtain the unexcelled enlightenment. (72)

[16] "Having lived for a long time in the household, which is extremely poisonous,[129] the root of affliction, the source of association with wicked people, they [i.e., bodhisattvas] renounce it with indifference. Having gone forth [from the household], they roam deep into the mountains, desirous of liberation. (73)

"Frequenting the wilderness and manifold hinterlands, [the bodhisattva] is unattached to all reputation and profit.[130] Indifferent to body and to life, he dwells fearless, like a lion, a subduer of enemies.[131] (74)

"Always relinquishing accumulation like a bird,[132] [a bodhisattva] is pleased with anything at all.[133] There is no abode in the entire world[134] for one who always seeks gnosis on the path toward enlightenment. (75)

"He lives alone like a rhinoceros; he is ever fearless like a lion. Like a skittish deer, he finds no rest in the world [i.e., he is never sedentary],[135] and he is never again haughty on account of homage [done to him]. (76)

"Looking upon this world plunged into a crevasse, [the bodhisattva] is roused for the sake of its liberation:[136] 'I too am to become a shelter for this world should I progress in the meritorious actions without neglect.' (77)

"[The bodhisattva's] speech is delightful and he always smiles while speaking;[137] his thoughts are never stirred toward what is agreeable or disagreeable. Striving to obtain the course of the Most Excellent of Men, he dwells unattached like the wind. (78)

"Focused on emptiness and signlessness,[138] he considers all conditioned things to be like illusions. Delighting in tranquility and self-restraint and possessed of broad intellect, he is content at all times with the taste of ambrosia [i.e., *nirvāṇa*]. (79)

"As [the bodhisattva] undertakes[139] the path toward enlightenment,

> **he always purifies his intent. Seeking the acquisition of *dhāraṇī*,[140] he desires virtue and endures hundreds of afflictions. (80)**
>
> **[17] "The bodhisattva, who, observing this religious course, makes it his aim, would be content. Which [bodhisattva] is of meager intelligence, who is indifferent to enlightenment, he begets[141] hundreds of vices." (81)**

"These four, Rāṣṭrapāla, are the pitfalls of bodhisattvas. Which four? Lack of respect, Rāṣṭrapāla, **is a pitfall of bodhisattvas. Ingratitude and fondness for deceit**,[142] Rāṣṭrapāla, **is a pitfall for bodhisattvas. Clinging to profit and honor**,[143] Rāṣṭrapāla, **is a pitfall for bodhisattvas. Extortion of profit and honor through trickery and boasting**, Rāṣṭrapāla, **is a pitfall for bodhisattvas. These**, Rāṣṭrapāla, **are the four pitfalls of bodhisattvas."** Then the Blessed One at that time spoke these verses:

> "They[144] are always disrespectful toward the noble teachers as well as toward their mothers and fathers. Given toward ingratitude and deceit,[145] these fools are always unrestrained in behavior. (82)
>
> "Always intent upon clinging to profit, they are fond of employing hypocrisy and deceit. [Such a one] will say: 'There is no one here in any way my equal in morality or virtues.'[146] (83)
>
> "Hostile to one another, they are constantly engaged in seeking each other's faults. Fond of agriculture and trade, the qualities of the *śramaṇa* are very far off for them.[147] (84)
>
> "Monks who are unrestrained during the final period [of the Dharma][148] are far removed from morality and virtue. They cause this Dharma to disappear as a result of their contentiousness, strife, and envy. (85)
>
> "Always distant from the path toward enlightenment, they are also very distant from the treasures of the Noble One [i.e., the Buddha]. Leaving behind the superior path toward liberation,[149] they roam in the five destinies." (86)

[18] **"These four things, Rāṣṭrapāla, cause an obstacle to enlightenment for bodhisattvas. Which four? Lack of faith**, Rāṣṭrapāla, **is something that causes an obstacle to enlightenment for bodhisattvas. Sloth**,[150] Rāṣṭrapāla, is

something that causes an obstacle to enlightenment for bodhisattvas. **Arrogance**,[151] Rāṣṭrapāla, is something that causes an obstacle to enlightenment for bodhisattvas. **Thoughts of envy and jealousy toward others worthy of honor**, Rāṣṭrapāla, is something that causes an obstacle to enlightenment for bodhisattvas. **These**, Rāṣṭrapāla, **are four things that cause an obstacle to enlightenment for bodhisattvas."** Then the Blessed One at that time spoke these verses:

> "When those who are always without faith, lazy, foolish, conceited, and enraged see a monk who is consistently patient and under control, they beat him with a stick, driving him from the monastery. (87)
>
> "There is no stability of thought for those here who feel envy on account of honor done to others. Seeing an opportunity for doing harm and seeking out the shortcomings [of others, they will say]: 'What is his transgression? On that I will accuse him.' (88)
>
> "Far from this teaching of mine, these enemies of virtue are headed toward a miserable end. Abandoning the teaching of the Victor, they will meet a searing, burning, and unfortunate end. (89)
>
> "But having heard of their sinful course and their wicked, extremely dreadful destiny, always be committed to the path toward enlightenment, lest you suffer by falling into unfortunate destinies yourself. (90)[152]
>
> "But once over many millions of aeons does a buddha, a Great Seer, appear for the benefit of the world. That precious moment has now arrived; relinquish[153] your wantonness today if you desire liberation." (91)

"These four, Rāṣṭrapāla, are persons who **should not be frequented by a bodhisattva. Which four? A corrupting friend**,[154] Rāṣṭrapāla, **is a person who should not be frequented by a bodhisattva. One who engages in wrong speculation on objectification**,[155] Rāṣṭrapāla, **is a person who should not be frequented by a bodhisattva. [19] One who rejects the True Dharma is a person**, Rāṣṭrapāla, **who should not be frequented by a bodhisattva. One who is covetous of worldly things is a person**, Rāṣṭrapāla, **who should not be frequented by a bodhisattva. These**, Rāṣṭrapāla, **are the four** persons who should not be frequented by a bodhisattva." Then the Blessed One at that time spoke these verses:

> "Those who reject corrupting friends will always enjoy virtuous friends.

They always prosper along the paths toward enlightenment, like the halo around the moon on days of the moon's waxing.[156] (92)

"[The bodhisattvas] who aim for buddha-gnosis[157] always reject, like a pot of poison,[158] those who are continually fixed upon wrong speculation on objectification and those who are fixed upon [the notion of] the 'self,' 'life-principle,' or 'personality.' (93)

"[The bodhisattva] who wishes to be awakened to the highest enlightenment should reject as pots of dung those who revile the tranquil Dharma of the Most Excellent of Men—a Dharma that is indifferent [toward worldly things] and in conformity with the deathless state [i.e., nirvāṇa]. (94)

"Moreover, [a bodhisattva] should not be intimate with but should reject like a fire pit[159] those intent upon worldly things, upon bowl and robe, and those who have always applied themselves to fraternizing with upper-class patrons. (95)

"He who has the desire to overcome Māra, to set in motion the highest, most excellent wheel [of the Dharma], and in this way to make [the Dharma] widespread for the sake of sentient beings—he must also reject corrupting friends. (96)

"Having renounced things dear and despised, profit, fame, contention, arrogance, and envy, [the bodhisattva] who desires to awaken to the highest enlightenment must always seek the gnosis of the Buddha." (97)

"These four things, Rāṣṭrapāla, result in suffering for bodhisattvas. Which four? Haughtiness on account of gnosis, Rāṣṭrapāla, is something that results in suffering for bodhisattvas. **Thoughts of envy and jealousy**, Rāṣṭrapāla, are something that results in suffering for bodhisattvas. **A lack of commitment**, Rāṣṭrapāla, is something that results in suffering for bodhisattvas. **Seeking after the use of impure gnosis and tolerance**,[160] Rāṣṭrapāla, is something that results in suffering for bodhisattvas.[161] **These**, Rāṣṭrapāla, **are the four[162] things that result in suffering for bodhisattvas."** Then the Blessed One at that time spoke these verses:

[20] "Those who preserve the Dharma in the world are honored among all humankind. The fool despises them;[163] therefore he experiences endless suffering. (98)

"He who improperly seeks[164] sensual enjoyments, who is always possessed of longing and desire for impure gnosis, and who is always arrogant and conceited does not pay homage to the teachers and saints *[āryajana]*.[165] (99)[166]

"He who has evil thoughts and is headed for the three unfortunate destinies has no inclination toward the Buddha and no inclination toward either the Dharma or the monastic assembly; he also has no inclination toward learning or the ascetic disciplines.[167] (100)

"The fool, the idiot, on account of his actions among men, falls from here to the hells, to the animal destinies, and to the *preta* destinies[168] where he suffers. (101)

"He whose intention is to be a lamp for the world on earth, who will bring about the destruction and end of suffering, a hero among men, by him should the path toward the unfortunate destinies be abandoned and the path toward enlightenment constantly cultivated." (102)

"These four, Rāṣṭrapāla, are fetters for bodhisattvas. Which four? Contempt for others[169] is a fetter for bodhisattvas. The notion that contemplation by worldly means is a sign of [religious] practice[170] is a fetter for bodhisattvas. Frequenting one whose mind is unrestrained, deprived of gnosis, or who is wanton,[171] Rāṣṭrapāla, **is a fetter for the bodhisattva.[172] Fraternizing with upper-class patrons for one whose mind is entangled [with them]**, Rāṣṭrapāla, **is a fetter for the bodhisattva. These**, Rāṣṭrapāla, **are the four**[173] fetters of bodhisattvas." Then the Blessed One at that time spoke these verses:

"He who always holds others in contempt and always practices meditation for worldly ends is bound by these false views,[174] like an elephant with an emaciated body [stuck] in the mud. (103)

[21] "He who is attached to the fetter of fraternizing with upper-class patrons is always wanton and stingy. The fool who has abandoned gnosis is bound by these undisciplined courses of conduct. (104)

"He who desires deliverance from this suffering and fear, and from birth, old age, death, and so forth, should always devote himself to the path toward enlightenment, having relinquished contempt and conceit. (105)

"Having borne endless suffering, having become wholly indifferent to every pleasure, and having entirely relinquished things dear and despised as well as reputation,[175] the resolute will become buddhas, free of stain. (106)

"Applying himself toward the six perfections, the stages [of bodhisattva training],[176] the virtues, and toward [the acquisition of] the [ten] powers, the [five] spiritual faculties, and gnosis, [the bodhisattva] will always be furnished with all virtues. He will become a buddha, liberated from the cage [i.e., the body] of old age." (107)

[The Former Exertions of the Buddha]

"Practicing formerly for inconceivably many aeons and training toward highest enlightenment for the sake of sentient beings, I was always well established in generosity, restraint, and control, having relinquished my relatives. (108)

"I always took pleasure in forests in the hinterland; I drained my body[177] for the sake of enlightenment. My heroic exertion never relaxed[178] as I sought[179] the gnosis of the Great Men. (109)

"Seeing sentient beings made to revolve through the five destinies in the world, a prison of existence, I formerly generated broad compassion here for them and obtained the most excellent enlightenment[180] for the sake of the world. (110)

"For many aeons, while I sought the most excellent enlightenment, I relinquished my own sons and daughters, my dear wives, cities rich in wealth and grain, my own cherished life, and very abundantly furnished land. (111)[181]

"When I was a sage in the forest, which was rich in enjoyable fruits, flowers, and ponds, I took pleasure in tolerance.[182] Even when both of my hands and feet were cut off by King Kali, I was not angry then at all.[183] (112)

[22] "When I was the sage Syāmaka, supporting my elderly parents in a forest cave,[184] I was not at all angry with the king who struck[185] me with a sturdy arrow. (113)

"Indifferent to my body, I threw myself from a rocky slope for the sake of the well-spoken [Dharma]. I was without regard for my body or my life on account of enlightenment. (114)

"For the sake of the lives of the tiger cubs,[186] I gave up my life so that the tigress would be satiated. Hosts of gods in the sky applauded, 'Well done, Great Man,[187] whose heroic exertion is steadfast.' (115)

"When I was training during former lives as a young brahmin who took great pleasure in giving, I dried up an ocean[188] for the sake of a jewel. Having obtained the gem, I made sentient beings pleased. (116)[189]

"When I was training as the sovereign Sutasoma of celebrated glory, hundreds of kings who were to be executed were quickly released by my fulfilling my duty. (117)

"Seeing a man afflicted and destitute, I forsook my own dear body. Obtaining wealth, I made him rich when I was the king Sarvadada. (118)

"When I was a king here,[190] I saw a pigeon who came for refuge, so I cut away my own flesh from my body. I gave away my own body, abandoning it without fear or distress. (119)

"When I formerly was the king Keśarin, every medicine without equal was procured for me by the foremost[191] physicians. But relinquishing my life, I gave it to others.[192] (120)

"When I formerly was the prince Sudaṃṣṭra, training for the sake of the world, I abandoned the devoted Madri and my son and daughter, indifferent and unattached[193] was I. (121)

"When I formerly was Uttaptavīrya,[194] I relinquished my wealth and power.[195] For a full 84,000 years, difficult tasks were endured by me. (122)

[23] "When I was the prince Vimalatejas, I set my body aflame with highest devotion before a *stūpa* containing the relics of the Victor as an act of homage toward those possessing the ten powers [i.e., the buddhas].[196] (123)

"When I was the king Candraprabha, [the demon] Raudrākṣa became angry and demanded my head. I cut it off and gave it to him. (124)

"When I was Puṇyasama,[197] I set up the best medicine for the sake of sentient beings at the entrances to streets in every town and village. (125)

"When I formerly was the sovereign Śubha, the bodies of thousands of beautiful women adorned with gold and pearls were relinquished by me when I was training in former lives. (126)

"When I formerly was the king Ratnacūḍa, I relinquished my supremely glorious crown, which was adorned with the most excellent flowers and scents as well as with gold and pearls.[198] (127)

"Formerly as the king Dhṛtimat I relinquished both my hands and feet, which were delicate as soft cotton and tender as the soft leaves of a lotus.[199] (128)

"When I was the merchant Siṃhala, I restrained hundreds of demons who were cruel, dreadful, ferocious, and violent and established the human beings on the island of Badara. (129)

"When I was Sunetra, I liberated some five hundred traders, fools who, infatuated with amorous desires, conceived of demonesses as young women. (130)

"Leaving behind forty million young women, beautiful as *apsaras*es, I went forth [from the householder's state] in order to undertake the teaching of the Victor when I was Puṇyaraśmi.[200] (131)

[24] "When I was the king Kāñcanavarṇa, training for the sake of sentient beings, I relinquished my exquisite fingers, which were adorned with webbing, stainless and pure.[201] (132)

"When I was the king Utpalanetra, I gave up my eyes, beautiful in color as a blue lotus, pleasing, and dear to the heart, for the sake of the world. (133)

"Seeing a woman who suffered the loss of her beloved husband, her appearance, self-esteem, and looks destroyed, I liberated her out of compassion when I was Keśava, chief among physicians.[202] (134)

"When I was Sarvadarśin in a former life, I saw a man suffering from disease. I offered him my own blood and made him disease-free. (135)[203]

"Taking[204] a bone from my own body, I gave the marrow to a man emaciated with disease. I never abandoned sentient beings when I was the king named Kusuma. (136)

"When I formerly was the king Arthasiddhi, I relinquished my entire treasury and renounced my dear and enjoyable life to save a man beset with calamity. (137)

"I gave away with indifference both of my lotuslike hands, marked with wheels, when I was the king Āśuketu, longing for enlightenment for the sake of the world. (138)

"When I was the ruler Sarvadarśin, I was compassionate, desiring the benefit and welfare of humankind. To that end, I relinquished the four continents that abounded in hundreds of the most excellent men and women. (139)

"When I was the princess Jñānavatī, I cut off flesh and blood from my own tender, soft, pure white thigh, gladly and with joy, and gave it away.[205] (140)

[25] "When I was the woman named Rūpyāvatī,[206] I beheld a woman afflicted by hunger and thirst. [For her sake] I gave up my pair of breasts, golden,[207] full, very tender, and dear to my heart. (141)

"As the king Viśrutaśrī, I relinquished many things that were difficult to relinquish: supremely delightful ornaments and numerous jewels, clothing, and chariots. (142)

"When I was the prince Kṛtajña, I rescued an ungrateful man from the ocean. Still, he plucked my eye out for the sake of a jewel, but I was not in the least angry. (143)

"When I was a lizard[208] in former lives, so as not to become a killer of ants, I abandoned my excellent body with indifference, my mind unmoved at that time. (144)

"When I used to roam as a partridge, I delighted in attendance and respect, always pleased to perform services for the aged, but without arrogance or being puffed up. (145)

"Generating compassion, I abandoned my bodily existence for the sake of one who had come for refuge. Even when I was an ape struck by an arrow, I did not abandon the hunter. (146)

"When I was an elephant, my body became emaciated after being captured by a king. Remembering my elderly elephant mother,[209] I did not eat the very pleasing food until I was released. (147)

"When I was the lord of the bears, I protected a man on an inaccessible snowy mountain crag for seven days. Even though this man abandoned[210] me to a killer, I felt no malice at that time. (148)

"When I was an elephant, [white] as snow or jasmine, I took recourse in the highest enlightenment and set out for the virtues of the Buddha. I was wounded with a poisonous arrow, but I felt no hatred in relinquishing my most excellent tusks. (149)

[26] "When I was a young partridge, ranging in the forest on the island of Khaṇḍaka and delighting in benevolence, I extinguished a fire as soon as I saw it.[211] Hosts of gods rained down flowers [in response]. (150)

"When I was a deer, I rescued someone being swept away by the waves of the Ganges River. Even when he led killers to me, I was not at all angry at him. (151)

"When I was born as a benevolent turtle, five hundred merchants, stranded at sea, helpless, were rescued by me, but they killed me out of hunger. (152)

"When I formerly was a fish living in water, training in the course toward enlightenment, I abandoned my body for the sake of sentient beings and was eaten by hundreds of thousands of living beings. (153)[212]

"Seeing the world afflicted with hundreds of maladies, I used my body as medicine and made sentient beings happy and healthy when I was at that time a serpent named Saumya.[213] (154)

"When I was a lion, king of the beasts, endowed with strength, power, and compassion, I did not become angry when struck with an arrow but felt loving-kindness toward the killer at that time. (155)

"When I was formerly the king of horses, white as a conch shell or snow, [living] on the seashore, I rescued merchants stuck in the midst of demonesses because I felt pity and compassion [for them]. (156)

"When I was a *kuṇāla* bird,[214] training in the course toward enlightenment for the sake of humankind, I avoided sensual pleasures, a multitude of vices, and did not fall under the power of women. (157)

"When I was a rabbit, living in a forest thicket, I taught this group of rabbits about meritorious action. There was a sage, inhabiting a hermitage and seized with[215] hunger, for whose benefit I sacrificed my body. (158)

"I was a parrot in a tree rich with flowers and fruit, but I did not abandon the tree when it withered. When I saw the grateful Śakra at that time, he made this tree rich again in leaves and fruits. (159)

[27] "When I was the king of the monkeys, I saw a group of monkeys attacked by the king of the *nāgas* and their territory conquered. But they were freed by me because of their [i.e., the *nāgas*] fear of the [monkey-] king.[216] (160)

"When I formerly was a parrot, carrying rice for the sake of my parents, I was seized by a man, who said, 'Why, parrot, do you take my rice; this will destroy my crop, bird.'[217] (161)

"The parrot replied: 'Good Sir, listen. I do not take this rice from you out of thievery. I take this rice for the sake of supporting both of my aged parents, out of pity for them.[218] (162)

" 'When you first scattered seed, [you said,] "I give a portion to all humankind."[219] Hearing you say these words to me, [I thought] there would certainly be no theft [in my taking the rice].' (163)

" 'Very well, parrot, take the rice as you please. Difficult to find is [even] a human being in whom there is such devotion. You are the human, we are the animals here. Excellent is your restraint, equanimity, and self-control.' (164)

"Formerly doing hundreds of such difficult to carry out acts,[220] I felt no distress at that time while seeking the highest pure enlightenment. (165)

"There is nothing internal or external that I have not given[221] when I trained in morality, tolerance, heroic exertion, meditation, stratagems, and wisdom. (166)

"I gave the flesh, skin, marrow, and blood from my very own body. When I was training in caves in the hinterlands, my body was drained. (167)

"The vehicle of ascetic discipline taught by the Victors is the one in which they applied themselves and became the Victors.[222] In that ascetic discipline I constantly exerted myself when I was steadfastly training in the past." (168)

[Reactions of Co-Religionists to This Teaching]

[28] "Such are the lofty vows that I observed while I was training. When [corrupt monks] hear about this course,[223] they will have no desire for even a single word [of the Dharma].[224] (169)

"There will be laughter when these contempuous rogues[225]—concerned with nothing but food and sex[226] and always overcome by indolence—hear about this teaching at that time. (170)

"When they hear this tranquil Dharma, these ignoble ones, who are always hostile to the Dharma, who offend against the teaching, and who are devoid of virtues, declare: 'This was not spoken by the Victor.'[227] (171)

"My teacher[228] was an ocean of knowledge, very learned, the best of expounders [of the Dharma]. And yet this *[sūtra]* was forbidden by him: 'It is by no means the word of the Buddha.' (172)

"Moreover, he too had an aged teacher, also possessed of an unlimited abundance of virtues,[229] and this *[sūtra]* was also not accepted by him: 'Do not apply yourself to it; it is false.'[230] (173)

[They charge:] " 'Where there is no "self," and neither "life-principle" nor "person" is taught in anyway whatsoever, useless are efforts here for one who applies himself to morality and undertakes vows of restraint. (174)

" 'If there is in fact a Mahāyāna, but no "self," nor "sentient being," nor "human being" in it,[231] useless are efforts carried out by me in it when there is no conception of "self" or "sentient being." (175)

" 'Invented, imagined by the evil-minded and by those who think like heretical teachers [are the Mahāyāna teachings]. The Victor could never have said these words, which are a rebuke against monks.' "[232] (176)

[The Degeneration of the True Dharma]

"Devoid of shame, embarrassment, and morality,[233] impudent, arrogant, haughty, and impetuous, there will be such monks here in my teaching who are consumed by jealousy, arrogance, and pride. (177)

[29] "Waving their hands and feet and shaking the edge of their robes [to attract attention], these 'ochre necks'[234] roam among the upper-class patrons in town as if intoxicated on liquor. (178)

"Taking up the banner of the Buddha,[235] they perform services for people in the household. They always carry letters,[236] having abandoned this teaching, which is a mass of virtues. (179)

"They keep cows, horses, asses, livestock, male and female slaves.[237] These ignoble ones are continually preoccupied with agriculture and trade. (180)

"There is nothing to them that is ignoble[238] or reproachable, nothing that is prohibited. What belongs to the *stūpa,* to the *saṅgha,* and what is acquired for oneself is all the same to them.[239] (181)[240]

"Seeing monks rich in virtues, they speak ill of them. These hypocrites are given to immorality and deception and cause the ruin of women, for they are truly horrible. (182)

"A householder is not as covetous with passions as these [corrupt monks] are after going forth. They would have wives, sons, and daughters just like a householder. (183)

"At which household they are favored with robes, alms, and requisites, they are desirous of the [householder's] wife, for these ignoble ones are always under the spell of defilements. (184)

"They always say to householders: 'These passions are not to be followed; they will cause you to fall[241] into the realm of animals, of the *preta*s, or to the hells.' And yet, they themselves are undisciplined and without composure. (185)

[30] "Just as they themselves are undisciplined,[242] their coterie of students is also not very disciplined. They will spend their days and nights in conversation about food and sex. (186)

"They [the senior monks] always give favorable treatment to them for the sake of service, not for the sake of virtue. Surrounded[243] by their own groups of pupils, [these monks think,] 'I will always obtain veneration here from these people.'[244] (187)

"They say to people: 'This favorable treatment of mine is out of compassion for them. I never ask for service from these groups of pupils.' (188)

"Many of the men who have come to them are overcome with disease, suffer from leprosy, or have various deformities in their limbs, but these ignoble ones always initiate [into the monastic life] whichever man[245] comes to them.[246] (189)

"Devoid of prescriptions and moral restraints,[247] they are always deficient in the virtues of a monk. They are not householders, and they are not monks; they are shunned like a piece of wood in a cemetery. (190)

"They have no regard for the rules of training or for the *prātimokṣa* or *vinaya*. They are impetuous and terribly unrestrained, like mighty elephants let loose from the goad. (191)

"Even among those who dwell in the forest, their thoughts will be preoccupied with the village. The mind of those who burn[248] with the fire of the defilements is not steady. (192)

"Forgetting all the virtues of the Buddha as well as the rules of training, the ascetic disciplines, and stratagems, those full of pride, arrogance, and conceit fall to the dreadful Avīcī Hell. (193)

"They always take pleasure in tales about kings and the recitation of fables about thieves. They delight in frequenting relatives, thinking about them day and night. (194)

[31] "Giving up meditation and study, they are always engaged in the affairs of the monastery. Desirous of dwellings, scowling [at others], they are surrounded by undisciplined pupils. (195)

[Thinking] " 'I am a laborer[249] for the monastery; I constructed it for my own sake. There will be room in the monastery for those monks who are well disposed toward me.' (196)

"Those who are endowed with good conduct and virtues, who preserve the Dharma, diligent for the sake of humankind, who are always disciplined in self-control and restraint, to them they show no favor. (197)

[They say] " 'This cell has been appointed for me and that one is for my fellow monk and this one is for my companion. Go! There is no dwelling here for you. (198)

" 'Beds and seats are completely given out; the monks established here are numerous. There is no opportunity for the acquistion [of requisites] here. How will you eat here? Depart, monk!' (199)

"They will never apportion beds and seats. They will have stores like householders, possessing many goods and attendants. (200)

"Even when they are reviled[250] on all sides, these sons of mine, remembering my words now[251] during the final period [of the Dharma],[252] will dwell in forests in the hinterland at that time. (201)

"Alas! When many monks have appeared who are preoccupied with profit and inimical to virtue, it won't be long before the teaching of the most excellent of Victors hastens toward ruin.[253] (202)

"Those who are disciplined in morality and virtue will be despised in the last period [of the Dharma]. Abandoning villages, kingdoms, and cities, they will dwell in the wilderness and forest. (203)

"Always honored but devoid of virtue, [such monks] will be divisive, treacherous, and fond of quarreling.[254] They are esteemed as teachers of the people, but they will be consumed by pride and conceit. (204)

[32] "This most delightful teaching of mine, a treasure of virtue, the source of all virtues, will now pass away to destruction on account of the failure of morality and the sins of envy and pride. (205)

"The teaching will linger like a jewel mine that has been plundered, like a lotus pond that is dried up, like a magnificently jeweled pillar[255] that has been shattered. But it will disappear during the final period [of the Dharma]. (206)

"The destruction of the Dharma occurs during the very dreadful[256] final period. And such[257] undisciplined monks as these will cause the ruin of this teaching of mine. (207)

"A fortunate destiny[258] will be somewhere far away for those who take pleasure in adhering to this course of conduct; the abode of those who have fallen from here will be the *preta* realm,[259] the hells, or the animal realm. (208)

"[Such a person] will experience severe pains and endless suffering for many hundreds of years, and should he be reborn in a human existence, he will be constantly afflicted and miserable.[260] (209)

"One who is always devoted to this evil course of conduct will be born blind, deaf, one-eyed, or with his various limbs severely deformed. He will have a loathsome and frightful appearance. (210)

"As for one who follows a wicked course of conduct, no one trusts him nor does anyone believe his words. He will always be reviled. (211)

"They will be afflicted with hundreds of diseases and sufferings and will be assaulted with clods of earth and blows from sticks. Tormented by fear of hunger and thirst,[261] they are always greatly despised. (212)

"Realizing that sufferings are endless, the mild-mannered[262] abandon their evil course of conduct. You too should apply yourself always to the good course, lest afterwards you have regrets. (213)

[33] "You for whom the Buddha is dear, as well as the noble assembly, and the qualities of moral training and ascetic discipline, apply yourself constantly in this way, relinquishing reputation,[263] profit, fame, and renown. (214)

"Fragile,[264] like an illusion, is that which is conditioned, unobservable like a dream. It won't be long before everything valued is lost; there is nothing permanent in this world. (215)

"Exert yourselves[265] and endeavor always in the perfections, the stages [of the bodhisattva training], and in the [spiritual] powers. Your efforts should never be irresolute up until the time you awaken to the most excellent enlightenment." (216)[266]

Two: The Story of Puṇyaraśmi

[The Faults of Bodhisattvas]

[34] These, Rāṣṭrapāla, will as a rule be the faults of those persons who are on the bodhisattva vehicle.[1] The undisciplined will pay homage to the undisciplined. The deceitful will pay homage to the deceitful. The ignorant will think the ignorant should be honored. They will value worldly goods, have numerous attachments,[2] be avaricious for upper-class patrons, as well as deceitful, impudent,[3] loquacious, hypocritical, and covetous of reputation.[4] They will extort profit through mutual praise,[5] and they will enter a village for the sake of seeking profit, not for the sake of bringing sentient beings to [spiritual] maturity or out of pity for sentient beings. These ignoramuses will assert themselves as wise,[6] saying: "How will others discern me to be learned in the excellent Dharma?" They will be disrespectful like those here who are undisciplined. They will be like broken vessels, seeking after each others' deficiencies. Their undertakings are fruitless; they are ignorant and slothful. They do not put much faith in gnosis.[7] Because of their accord with one another in a deviant Dharma,[8] they follow their own fancy, are relentlessly quarrelsome, and abound in malice. They will train [others] in the teaching at this time by convincing people with inappropriate exhortations.[9] They will not be disposed toward [religious] inquiry[10] nor will they be desirous of listening to the Dharma. They will receive rebirth in poor families on account of their undisciplined practice. Becoming renunciants from these poor families,[11] they will take satisfaction in the teaching at this time only for the sake of profit.[12] For them there will not even be the confession of sin, how much less the clear realization of gnosis. Leaving behind[13] the virtues of the buddhas, they will assert about themselves "we are ascetics"[14] only for the sake of reputation and profit. Rāṣṭrapāla, I do not speak of even a preparatory tolerance[15] for such persons, how much less buddha-gnosis. A fortunate destiny is far away for them, how much more enlightenment.

I speak of eight things, Rāṣṭrapāla, that cause an obstacle to enlight-

enment for persons such as these. Which eight? Rebirth in an unfortunate state,[16] rebirth in a poor family, rebirth in a border region, rebirth in a lowly family, being ugly and blind, association with corrupting friends, being terribly sick,[17] and dying in anguish.[18] I say these eight things, Rāṣṭrapāla, cause an obstacle to enlightenment. Why? I do not speak, Rāṣṭrapāla, of the enlightenment [35] of one who professes through words alone. I do not speak of the pure practice of a hypocrite. I do not speak of the course toward enlightenment of one who is deceitful. I do not speak of the homage to the Buddha of one who values worldly possessions. I do not speak of the pure wisdom of one who is conceited. I do not speak of the cutting off of doubt of one who is stupid. I do not speak of the pure intentions of one who is avaricious. I do not speak of the acquisition of *dhāraṇīs* of one who is without much commitment. I do not speak of the acquisition of a fortunate destiny of one who does not seek[19] good qualities. I do not speak of the pure body of one who has a passion for upper-class patrons. I do not speak of the encountering of buddhas[20] of one whose pursuit of the noble path is contrived.[21] I do not speak of the pure speech of one who is attached to upper-class patrons. I do not speak of the pure thoughts of one who is not respectful.[22] I do not speak of the desire for the Dharma of one who is immoderate. I do not speak of the quest for the Dharma[23] of one who is overly concerned with his body and life. Rāṣṭrapāla, I do not reproach the six heretical teachers[24] as much as I reproach these deluded persons. Why? Because the latter are the ones who speak falsely and act wrongly. They break their word to the whole world, including the gods.

Then at that time, the Blessed One spoke these verses:

> **"Unbridled,[25] haughty, proud, disrespectful, arrogant, abounding in avarice,[26] overcome with defilements, callous, and attached to property—very far indeed are such persons from highest enlightenment. (1)**

> **"Laziness increases for one overcome by profit; faith is lost for one overcome by laziness. For one whose faith is ruined, morality is lost; and for one who is immoral, a favorable destiny[27] is lost. (2)**

> **"[These corrupt bodhisattvas] went forth from the household on account of being poor but were freed from poverty only so as to obtain homage. It's like they threw away gold as a burden only to take up a load of grain.[28] (3)**

"Desirous of profit, [the corrupt bodhisattva] goes to the wilderness, but there he only seeks material gain[29] and frequents relatives.[30] Abandoning the accomplishment of the supernormal powers, spells *[vidyā]*, and eloquence, he holds onto his relatives.[31] (4)

"These fools, on account of their arrogance, will be subject to an evil state, a destiny among inopportune rebirths, poverty, and rebirth in a lowly family; they will be blind from birth and ugly,[32] having little strength. (5)[33]

[36] "Their dispositions are deficient in upright behavior and religious training while their mindfulness is ruined by negligence and profit. They will advance toward a great and terrible precipice from which there is no liberation for millions of aeons. (6)

"If enlightenment were possible in this world through profit, then even Devadatta would obtain enlightenment.[34] Just as birds are cast down by a wind from the Vairambha Ocean, so too are the undisciplined by profit. (7)

"Those [bodhisattvas] who have not obtained gnosis by their aspiration to enlightenment will be destitute of merit, desirous of others' wives, impure in moral conduct, and unrestrained[35] by meritorious actions. They will be as uninterested in the teaching as in a log at the cremation grounds. (8)

"Desirous of enlightenment, [the bodhisattva] seeks the buddha qualities but does not present himself as if possessing liberation.[36] Just as a monkey gets stuck by lime,[37] so too is the enlightenment of one overcome with conceit. (9)

"Because I desired enlightenment, I relinquished my very own precious life for the sake of a [single] word of the Dharma.[38] When those who are undisciplined abandon the [buddha-]qualities, they are unsuccessful [in their quest], and they fall from the teaching.[39] (10)

"Formerly I threw myself into a great abyss, ablaze and on fire, for the sake of the well-spoken [Dharma]. After listening to it, I was established in good conduct, relinquishing all that is dear and despised.[40] (11)

> **"Hearing about this wonderful teaching rich in virtues, no eagerness is generated in those [corrupt bodhisattvas] for even a single word. How could there be enlightenment for one who does not love the Dharma—as if there could be illumination[41] on a path for the blind?" (12)**

[The Story of Puṇyaraśmi]

Formerly, Rāṣṭrapāla, at a time incalculable, innumerable, inconceivable, unequaled, immeasurable, long, unfathomable aeons in the past, the Realized One, the Arhat, the Complete and Perfectly Enlightened One named Siddhārthabuddhi, Perfect in Knowledge and Good Conduct, the Well-Accomplished One, Knower of the World, Unexcelled Guide of Men that need to be trained, the Teacher of Gods and Men, the Buddha, the Blessed One appeared in the world. At that time, Rāṣṭrapāla, there was a king named Arciṣmat, who had a kingdom in Jambūdvīpa extending over 16,000 *yojana*s.[42] At that time, Rāṣṭrapāla, there were [37] 20,000 cities in Jambūdvīpa, each with thousands of millions of households. Moreover, Rāṣṭrapāla, this king Arciṣmat had a city named Ratnaprabhāsa, a capital where he lived. Extending twelve *yojana*s in length east and west and seven *yojana*s in breadth north and south, it was surrounded by seven walls exquisitely made with a checkered inlay of the seven precious substances.[43] At that time the life span of people was ten million billion[44] years.

Furthermore, Rāṣṭrapāla, King Arciṣmat had a son named Puṇyaraśmi, who was handsome, beautiful, pleasing to look at, and magnificantly endowed with the most excellent, splendid complexion. As soon as he was born, a thousand stores of the seven precious substances appeared—a single store of the seven precious substances appeared in the king's palace to the height of ten men. Moreover, Rāṣṭrapāla, when prince Puṇyaraśmi was born, all the people of Jambūdvīpa were delighted. Whoever was trapped by fetters, their fetters were loosed. In addition, Rāṣṭrapāla, Prince Puṇyaraśmi mastered in seven days all the worldly arts—as many as there are.

Then, Rāṣṭrapāla, the Śuddhāvāsakāyika gods roused Prince Puṇyaraśmi in the middle of the night. "Always be vigilant, young prince. Become skilled in reflection upon impermanence. Short, young prince, is the life of men. You will soon go to your next life; fear the other world. Do not neglect your obligations."[45] Then they spoke these verses:

"Do not be lascivious, young prince; do not fall under the power of intoxication. Vigilance is praised by the Well-Accomplished One; the wanton are censured by the Well-Accomplished Ones. (13)

"Those vigilant, mild-mannered ones here who are devoted to giving and restraint,[46] who not envious, whose minds are inclined toward compassion and loving-kindness for all beings—they will before long become the Highest among Men [i.e., buddhas]. (14)

"The innumerable Well-Accomplished Ones of the past, of the present, as well as those of the future have all appeared on account of their merits, firmly established on the vigilant path. (15)

[38] "They gave food and drink, clothes and meals, as well as gold, silver, gems, pearls, and ornaments for millions of aeons on account of their desire for supreme enlightenment. (16)

"When asked for their hands and feet or ears and nose, they give them gladly. It will not be long before those disposed toward all the qualities leading to enlightenment become the Highest among Men. (17)

"Entirely abandoning the enjoyment and fortune of the kingdom as well as your beloved wives, have recourse to the forest, free of desire, for conditioned things are like [what is seen on] a stage, like illusions. (18)

"Life is always unsteady and inconstant, fragile like a clay pot, like something borrowed, always transient; there is nothing permanent or pleasant about it, young prince. (19)

"Neither your mother, nor father, nor kinsmen[47] can preserve you here when falling[48] to an unfortunate destiny. Whatever auspicious or inauspicious deed is done by men follows them at death. (20)

"For many oceans of aeons have you killed one another out of passion and without reason. You have not done good for anyone. Useless indeed is the effort you are engaged in. (21)

"Now that you seek the benefit of the world, the peerless peace of enlightenment, the highest station, your marrow, flesh, and skin will wither should you not exert yourself. (22)

"For rare is the appearance of the Well-Accomplished One; even more rare is hearing the tranquil Dharma. Diligently shaking off Māra's faction, it won't be long before you acquire buddha-gnosis.[49] (23)

"Always frequent good friends and shun corrupting friends. Good friends inevitably lead you toward the virtuous path and consistently steer you away from the evil path. (24)

[39] "May you also exercise truly steadfast heroic exertion *[vīrya]*, relinquishing any desire for body or life. With an adamantine-like heart and firm determination, devote yourself to this very buddha path.[50] (25)

"All former buddhas [lit. "Highest among Men"], the Illuminators, took pleasure in the domain of the wilderness [when they sought][51] the supreme, unexcelled station that is difficult to obtain. You should follow in their footsteps. (26)

"Take pleasure always in wilderness dwelling as you completely relinquish your beloved mother, father, sons, kinsmen, and others dear to your heart, as well as the cravings that result from body and life. Seek now the extensive accumulation of gnosis of the Well-Accomplished One; seek the supreme, unexcelled station."[52] (27)

[Praise of Prince Puṇyaraśmi]

For the past ten years since then,[53] Rāṣṭrapāla, Prince Puṇyaraśmi has never been overcome with torpor or indolence, has never laughed, has not frolicked, has not gratified himself, has not amused himself, has never gone to parks for enjoyment, and has never been surprised when he saw friends. He has never desired song.[54] He has never longed for kingdoms, wealth, houses, or cities. Thus was he indifferent to all things.[55] Withdrawn and engaged in solitary reflection, he ponders the world, stuck in a condition of utter helplessness,[56] without substance, worthless, and unreliable.[57] He also ponders meeting with what is despised, separation from what is dear, and the joy of kingship, which deceives fools,[58] since one cannot enjoy the pleasures of *saṃsāra*, and beguiles, since one cannot be content with the pleasures of life.[59] He also thinks upon the state of the noninitiate *[pṛthagjana]*,[60] to which he is always adverse: "I am among foolish, undisciplined individuals; I should spend my time in silence." Alone, he fell silent. Pondering attentively separation from what is dear, he dwelled alone.

[Construction of the City Ratipradhāna for the Prince]

Then, Rāṣṭrapāla, King Arciṣmat had the city named Ratipradhāna[61] constructed at a certain spot for the young prince's enjoyment.[62] With seven hundred roads running north and south, it was surrounded on all sides with seven walls made of the seven precious substances, topped with networks of bells and canopies bedecked with pearl lattices and jeweled posts. Eighty thousand[63] jeweled posts were set up at every street entrance. On every jeweled post were fastened 60,000[64] jeweled threads. And to each jeweled thread were fastened fourteen [40] million rows of [jeweled] palm trees,[65] the sound of which, when agitated and struck together by the wind, would be like hundreds of thousands of musical instruments. Located at the entrance of each street were five hundred young girls in their prime, skilled in song and dance, there for the enjoyment of the whole world. King Arciṣmat gave them this command: "Day and night, you are not to so much as speak of anything but dance, song, and music. You are to charm everyone who comes from the four directions. In this way will pleasant thoughts be engendered in the young prince. Do not say anything unpleasant[66] to anyone." Moreover, at the entrance to each street, food is given to those who request food, drink to those who request drink, vehicles to those who request vehicles, as well as clothing, fragrances, garlands, unguents, bed and pillows, and the necessities of life. Gold, silver, gems, pearls, lapis lazuli, conch, crystal, coral, refined gold, ivory, elephants, horses,[67] a multitude of cows, all manner of ornaments, and heaps of jewels were also established for the pleasure of all people.

At that time, in the midst of the city, a house was constructed for the enjoyment of the young prince, a *yojana* in circumference, checkered with the seven precious substances and adorned with hundreds of arched doorways.[68] And he [i.e., the king] had a pavilion built there where four million couches were arranged for the enjoyment of the young prince. In the midst of this pavilion a park was marked off, completely filled and shaded by every kind of flowering tree, fruit tree, and jeweled tree. Now, Rāṣṭrapāla, in the midst of this park, he had a lotus pond constructed of the seven precious substances with stairways made of four precious substances, namely, of gold, silver, lapis lazuli, and crystal. There were 108 lion's mouths[69] by which scented water entered the lotus pond, and there were another 108 lion's mouths by which this water flowed out.[70] The pond was filled with blue and red lotus flowers, water lilies, and white lotuses continually in full bloom, surrounded ev-

erywhere by jeweled trees and with perennial flower and fruit trees. On the bank of this lotus pond were set up 108[71] **jeweled trees, and on each jeweled tree sixty jeweled threads were fastened.**[72] On each one of them millions of rows of [jeweled] palm trees were attached,[73] **and when agitated and struck together by the wind, a sound arose as when hundreds of thousands** of musical instruments **are sounded together. Above this lotus pond a jeweled net was spread** so that no dust or impurity would fall upon the young prince.[74]

[41] At that time four million seats made of the seven precious substances were arranged in the pavilion, and on each of these seats five hundred pieces of calico[75] **were spread. And among them a seat made of the seven precious substances was set up to the height of seven men, spread with eighty million**[76] **pieces of calico, where the Prince Puṇyaraśmi will sit. At the foot of each seat a pot of aloeswood incense was lit. Three times during the day and three times at night, flowers were strewn. Each seat was covered with a gold awning, from which were suspended golden lotuses; over each chair was spread a net of pearls, which shone with the splendor of gems and from which was suspended 80,000 [more jeweled nets].**[77] **On every jeweled tree were suspended hundreds of banners. And everywhere in the park were placed nine million**[78] **jewels with light rays extending a *yojana* in length;**[79] **the entire world was illuminated by their rays. Moreover, Rāṣṭrapāla, there were manifold birds in this park: parrots, maina birds, curlews, cuckoos, peacocks, geese, *cakra* birds, *kunāla* birds, sparrows, and pheasants,** including birds who talk like humans. **The intoxicating sound of their resounding trills arises** like that of the gods in Indra's pleasure grove.[80] **Foods having five hundred kinds of flavors, replete with all manner [of tastes],**[81] **were continually prepared for the enjoyment of the young prince.**

At that time, youths between the ages of sixteen and twenty shall be gathered from every city and brought to that city [i.e., Ratipradhāna]. Eighty million who were versed in the methods of the manifold arts and crafts and who were versed in all the worldly means of pleasure and service were brought to this city. A million young girls were given to him by his parents, a million by his relatives, a million by the people of his village, a million by each of the kings. These young girls were all beautiful, pleasant, lovely to behold; each was no more than sixteen years of age, and all were skilled in song, instrumental music, dance, comedy, and the sexual arts. They were all upright, youthful, sweet, and delicate.[82] **They were gracious in speech,**[83] **always smiling, skilled in service, and knew well the proper methods of all the arts. They were neither too tall nor too**

short, neither too thin nor too stout, neither too fair nor too dark-complected. The fragrance of blue lotus flowers wafted from their mouths and the fragrance of sandalwood wafted from their limbs. They were bedecked like divine maidens, charming in every respect.[84] Prince Puṇyaraśmi, situated among them with the sound of their chorus, thought to himself there in the midst of their singing and instrumental music: "Alas! This great assembly of enemies has appeared before me to destroy my meritorious qualities. [42] Look! I will be indifferent to them." It is just as if a man about to be killed sees the executioner[85]—he would not be surprised [about his fate]. In the same way, when Puṇyaraśmi saw these women,[86] he was not surprised, nor was he surprised by his female "companions" in that city. For these ten years,[87] the prince never grasped after the external features of form, sound, smell, taste, or touch. On the contrary, his mind was directed in this way: "When will I have liberation from the midst of such a group of so many enemies? When will I practice the vigilent training by which my liberation will be achieved?"

Then these young girls declared to King Arciṣmat: "The young prince, your lordship, does not frolic, nor enjoy himself, nor amuse himself with us."

Then, Rāṣṭrapāla, King Arciṣmat, together with 80,000 other kings, approached Prince Puṇyaraśmi with tears on his face, grieving, his body quivering, and fell to the ground. Picking himself up from the ground, he addressed Prince Puṇyaraśmi with these verses:

> **"Behold my wailing, most excellent jewel of a son. I have fallen to the ground in your house, afflicted with sorrow.[88] Tell me who committed this unpleasantness against you; I will punish him severely here and now. (28)**
>
> **"Behold now my city,[89] a delight to the multitude of gods, which I have willingly prepared for you. Tell me immediately which part of it is deficient; I will display for you today a fortune like Śakra's. (29)**
>
> **"Look at this multitude of women with beautiful, lotuslike eyes, the equals of *apsaras*es, who are now lamenting, afflicted with grief. Dispel your grief and enjoy yourself with them today.[90] Why should you brood, melancholic, like someone pierced by an arrow? (30)**
>
> **"These women have sweet voices.[91] They are versed in the arts of pleasure and know exactly the proper time for song and instrumen-**

tal music. Today is the time for you to be happy, not mournful. Why are you melancholic now like a withered lotus? (31)

"At your disposal is a park endowed with tree branches full of flowers, fruit, and leaves, like the brilliant and elevated Citraratha Grove of the gods.[92] Consider carefully that this is the prime of your life.[93] The time for delighting in pleasure is here and now. Be pleased, my son. (32)

[43] "This lotus pond of yours is equal to that of the gods, bestrewn with a thick cluster of blue lotus flowers for your ablutions. The lotuses are ornamented with the most excellent bees, intoxicated [with nectar]. Reflecting on them, who would not be delighted here, my son? (33)

"Listening to the delightful calls of geese, peacocks, parrots, maina birds, cuckoos, *koṇāla* birds, pheasants, and sparrows like on Mt. Gandharva-mādana[94] near the Himālayas, what man in this world would not find pleasure in them? (34)

"You have palaces bedecked with nets of pearls like Maṇicūḍa and inlaid with lapis lazuli and gold as in Indra's palace [Vaijayanta]. The best, most excellent jeweled seats are scattered[95] about, and there are golden bells like rows of palm trees that make lovely sounds. (35)

"The distribution of gifts[96] is announced on the streets for your sake by the deep, low-pitched resonance of the best musical instruments. Many songs of thousands of young girls are performed, like those of *apsaras*es[97] heard in the Nandana Grove. (36)

"Why are you distraught here in this lovely dwelling, which is like Indra's heaven, failing to enjoy yourself?[98] Young prince, your pleasure companions are like the offspring of the gods—enjoy yourself with them, son. Your mother and father are choked with tears. Have you no anguish or compassion for these people?"[99] (37)

Then he [Puṇyaraśmi], blessed with virtues, cognizant of the faults of existence, disgusted with what is conditioned, and not seeking after the enjoyment of the passions, declared: "Listen, your majesty," he said to his father, "seeing this world stuck in the cage of *saṃsāra*,[100] I desire liberation from it. (38)

"Your majesty, no one has done anything unpleasant to me; but I have no desire today for sensual pleasures. All that are dear are like enemies, unfit for attachment, which cause one to fall into the abyss of defilements and unfortunate destinies. (39)

"These women are pleasing to ignorant, stupid people. They are great pitfalls, bound by the noose of Māra. They are always so condemned by the [spiritually] ennobled *[āryajana].* How can I cherish those who are the source of affliction in the hells and unfortunate destinies? (40)

"These women are beautiful and pleasing only on the surface.[101] On account of its impurities, I have no interest in this contraption of sinews and bones. Oozing of excretions—blood, urine, and excrement—how can I delight in what are surely only suitable for a cemetery? (41)

[44] "I would not listen to song nor would I take up instrumental music; such pleasures are like dreams,[102] bewildering to the ignorant. The ignorant, attached to false discrimination, end up in ruin. Why should I be like a stupid person who is a slave to his defilements? (42)

"When frost appears, all of these trees and creepers will no longer be enjoyable as trees are in the forest. Impermanence destroys all beauty. Am I out of delusion to give myself up to wantonness in this unsteady life? (43)

"The mind is insatiable like the ocean. Desire is repeatedly attached to the continuation of craving.[103] Looking at the world where people kill one another out of passion, I will be as unshakable here[104] as Mt. Meru is by the wind. (44)[105]

"Neither you, father, nor my siblings, my wives, or my relatives, King, are protectors from an unfortunate destiny. We are all like a row of dew drops on a blade a grass. Papa, let us[106] not be subject to our emotions or be wanton. (45)

"To hell with youth, lord of men, which is not permanent. To hell with the course of life, which passes as fast as a mountain stream. To hell with what is conditioned and subject to decay—it is as tran-

sient as a thundercloud. To hell with sensual passion for the wise,[107] King, in the triple world. (46)

"I am urged on by the gods: 'Be vigilant. A bodhisattva does not cling to objects of the senses.' May I become a buddha here for the sake of and out of compassion for this world. There is no enlightenment, lord of men, for one who practices wantonness. (47)

"He who is afflicted with passion, King, is a slave to his emotions; intent upon the destruction of his merit, he has lost heaven. He should never act wrongly even toward one inflamed with hostility. Like a bird stuck in a cage, how could he be consoled? (48)

"The basic psychophysical elements *[dhātu]* are like snakes, the aggregates *[skandha]* akin to murderers, and the mind, fraught with depravities, is like a worthless, empty village.[108] The body, King,[109] has bloomed, as it were, on a poisonous stalk and is carried away by a flood.[110] How can I take pleasure in it? (49)

"You observe[111] this world, fallen to the wrong path, an abode manifestly ablaze like the sky. For their liberation I will quickly prepare the auspicious boat of Dharma[112] here and now, King, (50)

[45] "to awaken the sleeping, for the life of the afflicted, to extract the splinter, to train those who have gone the wrong way. Proclaiming the liberation from bondage to the Great-One-Thousand world-spheres[113] and satisfying those who have been long impoverished in the well-spoken [Dharma], (51)

"I will extricate the despondent from the path of unfortunate destinies and pluck out my eye for the blind while drying up the pangs of the entanglements of craving. [I will be] the light of wisdom, a lamp that has accomplished the highest liberation, by which [sentient beings] will see the triple world as like an actor's stage.[114] (52)

"Taking benevolence,[115] pity, compassion, and the perfections as a multitude of thunderclouds, which have resounded for the sake of sentient beings and are wreathed with the lightning of insight *[vipaśyanā]*, I cool the world, which has long been inflamed, with the waters of the cool, blissful rain bearing the limbs of enlightenment.[116] (53)

"Reflecting upon this, King, seated here, I have no impulse toward any passion belonging to what is conditioned. I set out here determined, desirous of enlightenment for the sake of sentient beings. I do not wish for the pleasures of existence. (54)

"What intelligent person, King, would dwell here among enemies? What wise man would traverse a dangerous path? Who with clear vision, papa, would fall from a precipice? Who, discovering the path to enlightenment, would remain wanton? (55)

"The whole world goes with the stream, but I[117] go against it. One cannot achieve enlightenment, King, by mere words. I would even be willing to fall into the ocean from Mt. Meru,[118] but my mind does not delight at all in the passions. (56)

"Go quickly, most excellent of kings, together with your subjects, and grant every pleasure of the kingdom to the whole world. Let them go taking whatever they wish, but I will not give in to wantonness, papa, even for millions of kingdoms. (57)

"In the midst of a multitude of women, one cannot achieve enlightenment, the auspicious state, the highest peace of spiritual discipline *[yogakṣema]*. I go and seek refuge in the mountain forest, where the Victor, who delighted in the wilderness, obtained enlightenment." (58)

[Praise of the Buddha Siddhārthabuddhi]

Then, Rāṣṭrapāla, prince Puṇyaraśmi, who had just gone to the roof of the palace, walking together with these women, his mind agitated,[119] passed the time in the three modes of bodily deportment. In which three? While standing, walking, and sitting, he relinquished torpor and indolence. Having gone to the roof of the palace, standing on the eighth floor, he heard at midnight the Śuddhāvāsakāyika gods approach from the sky, uttering praise of the Buddha. [46] They approached uttering at length praise of the Dharma and of the monastic assembly as well. Hearing this, Rāṣṭrapāla, Prince Puṇyaraśmi, the hair on his body and head bristling with joy, shed tears, and with manifested excitement,[120] pressed his hands together in salutation and spoke this verse to the gods:

“If, gods, you take pity on me, this distressed man, do not become angry should I ask about something. Of whose qualities do you speak, as you approach here in the sky?[121] Hearing this statement, my mind is pleased now.” (59)

Then, Rāṣṭrapāla, these gods addressed prince Puṇyaraśmi with the following verse:

“Have you not heard, prince, of the Buddha named Siddhārthabuddhi, who is a refuge for those without refuge? He is skilled in the highest course,[122] rich in merit, wisdom, and virtues; he has an assembly of ten thousand billions of disciples.” (60)

Puṇyaraśmi said:

“That I too might see the Victor, may you all tell me what his form is like and what his complexion is like. I also ask what the course toward enlightenment is like as he trained in it and became the sole protector of all sentient beings.” (61)

Then these gods addressed prince Puṇyaraśmi with the following verses:

“His unctuous, beautiful hair grows turning toward the right; his cranial protuberance is as resplendent as gold spread over a mountain. The tuft of hair between his eyebrows shines like the sun[123] in the sky, and his navel,[124] translucent as crystal, spirals clockwise. (62)

“His eyes are like blue lotuses, clear as a swarm of bees.[125] The Lord of Men, the Self-Existent One, has the jaws of a lion and lips like a bimba fruit. He emits endless thousands[126] of millions of light rays and illuminates the three-thousand-world chiliocosms, extinguishing the unfortunate destinies therein.[127] (63)

“His teeth are even, without interstices, well-rounded, bright, and very white, pure as snow or silver, and number forty. The most excellent of the supreme Victors has four canine teeth, and he has a long tongue that can cover his own face. (64)

[47] “He has a superlative voice,[128] coherent like the most excellent speech,[129] comforting, sensible, straightforward, and harmonious.

The voice of the Victor, equal to hundreds of thousands of musical instruments, allays doubt and is satisfying to those who want. (65)

"The voice of the Victor, possessed of manifold, flawless virtues conforming to the limbs of enlightenment, is festooned with qualities strung together like a hundred thousand pearls. It resounds with a pleasure like that derived from musical instruments. Pleasing, like the songs of the gods, it is as refreshing as the charming voice of the gods. (66)

"It has the sound of celestial musicians *[kiṃnara]*, of cuckoo birds, of *kokila* birds, of *cakra* birds, of peacocks, of geese, and of *konālaka* birds. The sound of his supreme voice has the vocal qualities of celestial musicians; unwavering and without imperfection, it yields comprehension of all meanings. (67)

"Smooth like translucent crystal, agreeable to the sages, inspiring, taming, purifying,[130] affectionate, in conformity with the highest course, satisfying when questioned—these are the qualities of the speech of this Lord of the Dharma. (68)

"The neck of the Teacher[131] is as beautiful as a conch shell, his shoulders rounded, his arms like long iron bars, and he possesses seven limbs with protuberances.[132] His hands are beautiful and well-rounded, his fingers long and round. The body of this Victor has the color of refined gold. (69)

"The hairs on his body grow individually, turning toward the right. His navel[133] is complete and inaccessible, and his penis is concealed in a sheath like that of a horse. The Self-Existent One has thighs like the trunk of an elephant and calves like an antelope; the palms of his hands are adorned with swastikas and wheels.[134] (70)

"Sauntering with the gait of the lord of elephants, with the strides of a lion, and with the grace of a bull, he is mighty as [the *nāga*] Indrayaṣṭi. A rain of flowers from the sky becomes parasols of flowers; when he walks, they follow him. These are his marvelous qualities.[135] (71)

"For the Victor, in profit and in loss, in comfort and in pain, in dis-

grace and in fame, and likewise in censure and in praise, this lion among men is entirely unbesmeared, as a lotus is by water. Thus there is no sentient being here equal to him." (72)

[Puṇyaraśmi Seeks the Bodhisattva Path]

Then, Rāṣṭrapāla, when Prince Puṇyaraśmi had heard this praise of the Buddha and had heard this praise of the Dharma and of the *saṅgha* at length, he was pleased, enraptured, delighted, overjoyed, happy, and gladdened.[136] Then, Rāṣṭrapāla, it occurred to Puṇyaraśmi: "What is the Perfect Buddha, the Blessed One like? Of what sort is his *saṅgha*'s excellence? [48] What kind of Dharma did he realize? Of what sort is his pupils' excellence, such that [they understand] *saṃsāra* to be meeting with misfortune;[137] that *saṃsāra* is ungrateful; that foolish noninitiates are ungrateful; that the belief in a real personality is wrong; that living in the household involves much distress; that the passions involve much sin; that wantonness is condemned by the learned; that the darkness of ignorance results in confusion; that karmic predispositions [*saṃskāras*] are difficult to penetrate; that the mind is difficult to restrain; that individuality *[nāmarūpa]* is profound; that the six sense-fields are unreliable;[138] that contact has suffering as its fruits and is devoid of true knowledge; that feelings involve much distress; that craving is a tightly fastened fetter; that clinging is difficult to escape; that the craving for existence is ignoble; that when one does come into being, birth is difficult to cut off; that old age brings about deterioration; that sickness causes ruin; that death is without affection;[139] that the process [of coming into being] is a source of little enjoyment; that arriving at coming into existence is a source of much distress; and that the teaching of the Realized One is gratifying. This is not possible for one who is a slave to the passions, who is enraptured by defilements, who is hard of heart, who is overcome with wantonness, who is situated among fools, whose thoughts are superficial, whose thoughts are attached to *saṃsāra*, or who is situated among evil people. Such a person cannot even purify the path to fortunate destinies, let alone realize unexcelled, complete and perfect enlightenment."

It occurred to him: "Perhaps I should throw myself from the eastern side of the palace, lest my many relatives create an obstacle should I depart through the door."

Then, Rāṣṭrapāla, Prince Puṇyaraśmi, facing the Blessed One, the Realized One Siddhārthabuddhi, threw himself from the palace and

said: "If the Realized One knows everything and sees everything, the Realized One must take notice of me." Then, Rāṣṭrapāla, the Realized One, the Arhat, the Complete and Perfectly Enlightened One Siddhārthabuddhi stretching out his right hand, emitted a ray of light that reached Prince Puṇyaraśmi. From this ray of light appeared a 100,000-petaled lotus flower with the dimensions of a carriage wheel. And from this lotus flower 100,000 light rays issued forth, creating a great splendor by which Prince Puṇyaraśmi was suffused. Then, Rāṣṭrapāla, Prince Puṇyaraśmi, standing on this lotus flower, reverentially saluted the Blessed One, the Realized One, the Arhat, the Complete and Perfectly Enlightened One Siddhārthabuddhi, and joyously uttered, "Homage to the Buddha!"[140]

Then, Rāṣṭrapāla, this ray of light was withdrawn by the Realized One Siddhārthabuddhi. The [49] prince fell at the feet of the Blessed One like a chopped-down tree and saluted the Realized One hundreds of thousands of times.

Then, Rāṣṭrapāla, Prince Puṇyaraśmi addressed the Blessed One with these verses:

> **"Having suffered a long time, I have today finally[141] met with the King of Physicians with great difficulty.[142] Relate to me, Protector, how I may come to be established in the teaching of the Well-Accomplished One. (73)**
>
> **"I have learned diligence,[143] Guide, as I received instruction at night from the gods[144] in the sky. But having learned it, I came to be agitated: 'How can people continue to be wanton?'[145] (74)**
>
> **"Be a guide[146] today for him who has lost his way; be the eyes today for him who was born blind. Extricate me from this great precipice, you who are an engenderer of faith, a compassionate physician. (75)**
>
> **"Be kindly disposed toward me, a wretched man; release me today, Protector, fettered though I am. Cut off uncertainty from doubts and explain to me the course for the path to enlightenment. (76)**
>
> **"Show the right passage[147] to me, who am swept away;[148] make yourself a lamp for me in the darkness. Heal me who am wounded; extricate the arrow from me, King of Physicians. (77)**

"Liberate me from the strait of unfortunate destinies; sever my embrace of false speculations on existence. Cause me to traverse to the other shore of the great flood of distress by means of the great course that is the eightfold path. (78)

"Life is short, subject to decay, and fraught with many obstacles to merit. The fruition of merit occurs before long. Now I have the opportunity: speak to me about the one certainty [in life]. (79)

[50] "Elucidate this for me, World Protector: how a bodhisattva might become vigilant, and how, practicing the highest course to enlightenment, I may liberate the world from the fetters of existence." (80)

Then, Rāṣṭrapāla, the Realized One Siddhārthabuddhi, knowing the disposition of Prince Puṇyaraśmi, elucidated the course to enlightenment in great detail. Having heard it, Prince Puṇyaraśmi obtained the *dhāraṇī* called "Liberation" *[vimokṣā]*[149] and obtained the five supernormal powers. Stationed in the sky and magically creating flowers, he scattered and bestrew them upon the Realized One.

[Glorification of the Buddha Siddhārthabuddhi]

Then, Rāṣṭrapāla, prince Puṇyaraśmi, descending from the sky, praised the Blessed One, the Realized One Siddhārthabuddhi with these verses:[150]

"I salute you, [whose body] resembles the color of gold and is possessed of the supreme marks, whose face is like the bright full moon. I salute you, bearer[151] of unparallelled gnosis; there is no one like you, free of blemish, in the triple world. (81)

"Your hair, Victor,[152] is soft, lovely, unctuous, and beautiful; your cranial protuberance is like the king of mountains [i.e., Meru]. There is not seen a cranial protuberance equal to yours. The tuft of hair on your most excellent[153] eyebrow, Sage, is radiant. (82)

"Your superb eyes, by which you see this world with compassion, are as white as jasmine, the moon, a conch shell, or snow—beautiful as blue lotuses. I salute you, the pure-eyed Victor. (83)

"Your tongue is long, thin, and copper-colored, and with it you can cover your own face. Proclaiming the Dharma, you discipline the world.[154] I salute you, who have a sweet, lovely voice. (84)

"Your teeth, bright and hard as diamond, number forty and are adjoined without interstices. When you smile, you discipline the world. I salute you, whose speech is sweet and true. (85)

[51] "You are unequaled in appearance, Victor; you illuminate hundreds of [buddha-]fields with your radiance. Brahmā, Indra, and the protectors of the world, Blessed One, are obscured by your radiance. (86)

"Your antelope-like calves, Blessed One, are unmatched; you have the gait[155] of the lord of the elephants, the peacock, or the lord of beasts [i.e., the lion]. You walk looking ahead only a plow's length,[156] Blessed One, making the earth and mountain slopes tremble. (87)

"Your body is replete with marks, Blessed One, and your[157] smooth[158] skin is the color of gold. The world cannot get enough of looking upon this form of yours, possessor of unparalleled beauty. (88)

"I salute you, supremely compassionate one,[159] who practiced austerities *[tapā]* for hundreds of former aeons, who took pleasure in every form of renunciation, restraint, and generosity, and who is devoted to pity and loving-kindness toward all sentient beings. (89)

"I salute you, unparalleled bearer of gnosis, who constantly delights in generosity and morality, who is steadfastly[160] devoted to tolerance and heroic exertion, and who possesses the light and splendor of meditation and wisdom. (90)

"I salute you, who inspire supreme affection, you who are the champion of proclaimers [of the truth], the crusher of bad teachers. You roar like a lion in the assembly, and you, King of Physicians, bring an end to the three impurities. (91)

"I salute you, Sage, who has gone to the farther shore of the three states of existence, pure in speech, body, and mind, undefiled in the three states of existence like a lotus in water, you whose supreme voice is like the song[161] of the cuckoo. (92)

"You know this world is like an illusion, akin to an actor's stage or a dream. There is neither self, nor being, nor life-principle, nor destiny; [all] things are a mirage, like the moon on the water. (93)

"The world reels, not knowing the principle [that all things] are empty, tranquil, and unproduced. You cause [the world] to understand by means of hundreds of stratagems, principles, and expedients out of compassion[162] for them. (94)

[52] "Seeing the world always afflicted[163] with passions, and so forth, and with many hundreds of diseases, you, the unparalleled, most excellent physician,[164] go about rescuing hundreds of sentient beings, Well-Accomplished One. (95)

"Seeing[165] the world suffer from the afflictions of birth, old age, and death, always pained on account of hundreds of lamentations and separation from what is beloved, you go about rescuing it, Sage, out of compassion. (96)

"The whole world reels like the wheel of a chariot among the animals, among the *preta*s, in the hells, and among the fortunate destinies.[166] The foolish, the guideless, those who have become helpless—you explain the most excellent[167] path for them all. (97)

"You too, unparalleled, Mighty One, teach the very noble path that was proclaimed by the former Victors, the Lords of the Dharma, who produced great benefit for the world. (98)

"You utter speech that is agreeable, not harsh,[168] supremely pleasing, superior to Brahmā's, which causes the highest pleasure and surpasses that of *gandharva*s, *kiṃnara*s, and *apsaras*es. (99)

"Having heard about the endless virtues of your voice, which is true, sincere, and inexhaustible—purified by creative stratagems and prudent methods—hundreds of billions of sentient beings, Victor, achieve[169] tranquility [i.e., *nirvāṇa*] by means of the three vehicles. (100)

"By paying homage to you, they obtain heavenly bliss of many kinds among men; such a person will become a king—rich, wealthy, and powerful—who benefits the world. (101)

“A powerful universal monarch, the ruler of the continent, envelopes the world with the ten meritorious actions. He receives the seven truly splendid jewels and generates faith in you, Unparalleled One. (102)

“One[170] will become a Brahmā god, a Śakra, a world-protector deity, or lord of the [Tuṣita] gods, Saṃtuṣita. One will become a Parinirmita[171] god or the lord [of the Yāma gods] Suyāma[172]—all by paying homage to you, Victor. (103)

[53] “Thus worship performed toward you is efficacious; seeing and hearing you is unequaled. [By this] one becomes a remover[173] of the manifold sufferings of the world and experiences the supreme, undecaying, most excellent station.[174] (104)

“Knowing the path, skilled in the path, you, Blessed One, avert the world from an evil course. You cause the world, Blessed One, to be established on the noble path, which is reassuring, auspicious, and blemish free. (105)

“For you with a wealth of merit,[175] a store of merit, meritorious action is always inexhaustible.[176] It lasts for many millions of aeons until one experiences the highest enlightenment.[177] (106)

“One will then obtain a pure [buddha-]field, radiant like the [abode of the] Paranirmita gods and always pleasing. The sentient beings in that most excellent field will be pure in body, speech, and mind. (107)

“A person obtains such manifold virtues produced by homage done to the Victors: he will obtain[178] heaven, emancipation, happiness among men, and a store of merit for the whole world. (108)

“Your renown and fame are broad, extending in every direction toward many hundreds of [buddha-]fields. The Well-Accomplished Ones constantly sing your praises in their assemblies, Victor. (109)

“I salute you, Blessed One, most excellent and superb among men, who is freed of distress, who liberates the world, who is a pleasure to behold—the supremely[179] compassionate one—whose faculties are tranquil, and who takes pleasure in equanimity. (110)

"I have obtained[180] the five supernormal powers, Victor; I listen to your voice while stationed in the sky. I will be equal to the Well-Accomplished One,[181] Hero. I will explain the stainless Dharma to the world. (111)

"And may the world reach buddhahood *[buddhapadam]* by the extensive merit that I have acquired[182] by extolling today the Well-Accomplished One, who has mastered all virtues and is honored by men, gods, and *nāga*s." (112)

[King Arciṣmat Follows His Son to the Buddha Siddhārthabuddhi]

[54] Then, Rāṣṭrapāla, at daybreak King Arciṣmat heard the sound of weeping inside the prince's harem. Upon hearing it, he quickly rushed to the city Ratipradhāna and said: "Why are you ladies crying?" They replied, "Prince Puṇyaraśmi has disappeared." Then, Rāṣṭrapāla, King Arciṣmat, on account of [this news of] the prince, fell to the ground like a tree chopped down. Picking himself up from the ground, he circuited the city a thousand times, crying.

Then, Rāṣṭrapāla, the municipal deity in that town said to King Arciṣmat: "The prince has gone, Great King, in the eastern direction in order to see, to salute, and to honor the Realized One Siddhārthabuddhi."

Then, Rāṣṭrapāla, King Arciṣmat went in the eastern direction together with the prince's harem and eighty-four hundred thousand billions of millions of living beings. Having approached to where the Realized One, the Arhat, the Completely and Perfectly Enlightened Siddhārthabuddhi was, and bowing his head at the feet of the Blessed One, he stood to one side. Standing to one side, King Arciṣmat lauded the Blessed One with these verses:

"I salute this ocean of virtues and gnosis, a hero among men, with whom there is no equal, much less a superior in this triple world, who is honored by the lord of the gods and the king of the *asura*s, the most excellent being. A person cannot get enough of looking upon your corporeal form. (113)

"The thirty-two marks on your body are extremely clear; like Mt. Meru, [your body] is adorned as with superb jewels, completely pure. I salute the smooth body of the sage, which resembles the color of gold, the sight of whose agreeable form is pleasing to the Victors. (114)

"Hundreds of millions of vows were observed [by you] for incalculable aeons; hundreds of millions of buddhas were honored [by you] for many aeons. You have offered[183] inconceivable and immeasurable[184] hundreds of sacrifices, and because of this, your beautiful body shines. (115)

"Your form was purified by your generosity, morality, concentration,[185] and wisdom; by your tolerance, heroic exertion, meditation, and stratagems. In your presence, the splendor and radiance of the sun and moon stones[186] are not brilliant; the radiance of Śakra and Brahmā is not bright. (116)

"You appear in a pleasing form for the sake of the world, resembling in appearance the moon in the water, like an illusion. In every direction the body of the Victor is seen, but the extent of the form of the Well-Accomplished Ones is not seen.[187] (117)

[55] "At certain times you appear dwelling among the Tuṣita gods, being carried [in the womb] again as a pure white elephant. Even when you appear in your mother's womb, Hero, you pervade everywhere, Great Sage, like the sky. (118)[188]

"At certain times you manifest yourself being born, and you appear at certain times going seven steps in the cardinal directions on the ground, uttering these words: 'I am the foremost in the world, together with its gods and men. Surpassing the gods, I will liberate the world from the ocean of suffering.' (119)

"Even though you have no doubt whatsoever with regard to the Dharma, Sage, you appear to the world to need instruction in the knowledge of writing. You appear sometimes in the midst of women despite having attained a tranquility that is accessible through meditation and concentration. (120)

"Leaving behind your mother and father, your harem on the ground,[189] and your relatives, who are tormented by sorrow, stupefied, and lamenting,[190] you are seen departing for a spot to dwell in the forest, surrounded by hundreds of millions of gods, Most Excellent of Beings. (121)

"Even though you subdued the four Māras[191] a long time ago, you still appear in this field overpowering the Māras. Although you formerly turned the inconceivable wheel [of the Dharma], you appear now turning the wheel out of compassion. (122)

"Seeing the world always under the misconception of the eternalist heresy, you tell the assemblies, 'I will pass into extinction.' Seeing the world to be perpetually contented in *saṃsāra,* you speak of the extinction that is the tranquil, cool state. (123)

"There is no one equal to you in merit or gnosis, stratagems or wisdom. You pervade many [buddha-]fields, Sage, with the radiance of your body. The Guides [i.e., other buddhas] in the cardinal directions sing your praise.[192] I laud you, whose domain is without bounds, King among Sages. (124)

"And we salute the truth *[dharmatā]* that you have completely realized. You appear in the affairs of all sentient beings as an illusion. There is neither coming nor going for you anywhere.[193] I salute you, Sage, who are established in such an illusory state.[194] (125)

"It is excellent, Hero among Men, that you proclaim this supreme path by which supreme enlightenment is attained for the sake of the world. Having quickly awakened to this truth too, may I teach the truth for the sake of the world, Hero among Men. (126)

[56] "There is no one equal, much less superior, in this triple world to the omniscient Hero among Men who is freed from distress. May the world attain the peace that is the most excellent, unexcelled enlightenment by means of the merit that I have gained by praising you." (127)

Then, Rāṣṭrapāla, the Realized One Siddhārthabuddhi, knowing the disposition of King Arciṣmat, taught the Dharma so that everyone would become irreversibly set toward unexcelled, complete and perfect enlightenment.

[Puṇyaraśmi Makes Offerings to the Buddha Siddhārthabuddhi]

Then, Rāṣṭrapāla, Prince Puṇyaraśmi said to the Blessed One, the Realized One Siddhārthabuddhi: "May the Blessed One accept an invitation to our town tomorrow for food." The Blessed One consented to Prince Puṇyaraśmi's invitation out of sympathy by remaining silent.

Then Prince Puṇyaraśmi addressed his mother and father[195] and the women [of the palace]: "May you approve, all together and in common, that I present, with complete indifference, the Realized One with

the town of Ratipradhāna with all its accoutrements." They all approved in chorus.

Then, Rāṣṭrapāla, Prince Puṇyaraśmi presented[196] the town of Ratipradhāna with all its accoutrements to the Realized One with complete indifference. He bestowed upon the Realized One and the assembly of monks food with an array of five hundred flavors. For all of these monks he had monasteries made, covered with the seven precious substances, provided with jeweled walkways, above which were spread an abundance of jeweled canopies, well appointed on the left and right with flowering trees, adorned with lotus ponds, and on both sides, couches and seats that were provided with hundreds of thousands of spotless pieces of calico on top. Respectfully saluting[197] the monks one by one, he gave each a robe individually. Additional robes were presented each day.[198]

For three million years he was not overcome with torpor or indolence. He did not act out of self-love, and he thought about nothing other than the worship of the Buddha.[199] During this period he did not ruminate upon the passions, malice, causing harm, nor did he develop a craving for kingship. He was in every respect indifferent toward his body and toward his life—how much more so toward any other external things. During this period, he learned everything taught by the Blessed One, never having to ask the Realized One a second time. During this period, he did not bathe, nor were his limbs anointed with ghee and sesame oil, nor did he wash his feet. He had no conception of being tired; he never [57] sat down except to eat or to excrete.

When this Realized One entered *parinirvāṇa*, he [Puṇyaraśmi] had a pyre of red sandalwood made on which the Realized One was cremated,[200] and on that very spot of ground he worshiped his relics for hundreds of thousands of years. Having performed every act of worship and honor with every flower, with every wreath, with every unguent, and with every musical instrument in the whole of Jambudvīpa, he afterwards had 94[201] million *stūpas* erected. These *stūpas* were enveloped in jeweled lattices made of the seven precious substances and were covered with a canopy of pearl lattices. He raised five hundred parasols made of the seven precious substances on each *stūpa* and at every *stūpa* he sounded hundreds of thousands of musical instruments. He also planted flowering trees all over Jambudvīpa. And at each *stūpa* he lit hundreds of thousands of lamp pots. In each of these lamp pots a thousand[202] wicks were set aflame with oil of every scent, and he performed worship with every incense, garland, and unguent.

[Puṇyaraśmi Goes Forth from the Household]

After performing worship for millions of years in this way, he went forth from the household. Having gone forth, he became a wearer of the three robes; he always practiced begging for alms, and he only sat, never lying down.[203] He was never overcome with torpor or indolence. With his mind free from worldliness, he gave the gift of Dharma for four million years without so much as an applause expected from another, how much less profit and honor. And he never tired of listening to the Dharma or teaching the Dharma. The gods attended upon him. In imitation of him, the entire country, his harem, all of his servants, and all of his companions went forth from the household.

Then, Rāṣṭrapāla, it occurred to the Śuddhāvāsikāyika gods: "The entire kingdom has gone forth from the household in imitation of Puṇyaraśmi. Should we serve and attend upon him, service to the Three Jewels would be done as well." Then after the Realized One entered *parinirvāṇa*, the True Dharma lasted for 64 million years, the whole of which was grasped by the monk Puṇyaraśmi. In this way such worship was done to 94,000 millions of billions of buddhas.[204]

[Characters of the Story Revealed]

Perhaps now, Rāṣṭrapāla, you have some doubt, or uncertainty, or hesitation that at that time this King Arciṣmat was somebody else. You shouldn't look at it like that. Why? Because at that time the Realized One Amitāyus was in fact the King Arciṣmat.

Perhaps, Rāṣṭrapāla, you think that at that time prince Puṇyaraśmi was somebody else. You shouldn't look at it like that. Why? Because at that time I [Śākyamuni] was [58] prince Puṇyaraśmi. And the one who was the municipal deity was none other than the Realized One Akṣobhya.

[Warnings against Sham Bodhisattvas]

Therefore, Rāṣṭrapāla, the bodhisattva *mahāsattva* who desires to be awakened to the unexcelled, complete and perfect enlightenment should imitate prince Puṇyaraśmi with determined practice, by relinquishing what is dear and despised, and by training in self-control. It was by accomplishment in such arduous tasks[205] that I obtained the unexcelled, complete and perfect enlightenment. But there are those[206]

who are undisciplined, who attach importance to profit, honor, and renown, who are attached to relatives,[207] who are overcome with pride and smitten with profit, who are wretched and exert themselves in vain for the sake of profit, who are far from the teaching, who have become renunciants for no reason, who are disparagers of ascetics, who are unruly bodhisattvas crooked in body, speech, and mind, who hint at a desire for gifts [from lay patrons], whose assertions are false, who have reneged on their own promises,[208] who indulge in hinting for personal belongings, including robe, bowl, bedding, seats, requisites for the sick, and medicines, who are shameless, indecent, ill-mannered, committed to false doctrines, devoid of good associations, who have become distant from association with buddhas, who are separated from the gnosis of the Buddha,[209] who are devoid of the aspiration for liberation,[210] and who are devoid of the aspiration toward enlightenment. Therefore, Rāṣṭrapāla, you should know from hearing such a Dharma as this that they are corrupting friends, undisciplined[211] seekers after profit,[212] and not to be frequented.

Then the Blessed One at that time spoke these verses:

> **"In the unfathomable training of the Buddha,[213] there are those whose hearts are overwhelmed by profit and by relatives.[214] Abandoning enlightenment, which is replete with hundreds of virtues, they are attracted to the patrons[215] of others for the sake of profit. (128)**

> **"These wicked rogues, under the power of Namuci [i.e., Māra],[216] have forsaken modesty and steadfastness for the sake of public reputation.[217] Subject to the defilements and destined for rebirth in states of worldly existence, they say thus: 'We too are virtuous.' (129)**

> **"Their bodies are in the forest, but their attention is in the city. Their religious practice is contrived for the sake of profit. Far off, like the distance between heaven and earth, is liberation for them. Leave[218] them far behind, like snakes. (130)**

> **"Neither the Buddha nor the Dharma is dear to them;[219] likewise the *saṅgha*, which is replete with hundreds of virtues. Abandoning heaven, they have set out on the heterodox path and are distressed over hundreds of existences by the eight obstacles. (131)**

[59] "Having heard about the religious course that I have taught, you should control yourselves with proper behavior as a result of genuine determination for it. You have obtained an opportunity[220] that was unattainable for many millions of aeons. Therefore, one should apply oneself to the truth *[dharmatā]* as taught here. (132)

"He who wishes to be awakened to the most excellent enlightenment in the most excellent vehicle should call to mind the virtues of the Lord of the Earth [i.e., the Buddha]. Reflecting thoroughly according to how things are, he should persevere. He thus succeeds in attaining the enlightenment of the Well-Accomplished Ones without obstacle. (133)

"One who beholds these virtues and cultivates the traditions of the spiritually ennobled would thereby generate gnosis here as desired.[221] Thus do not give up the teaching, which contains the very essence of virtues, lest you end up like fools in all five destinies. (134)

"May you dwell in crags, in the wilderness, and in caves, and abiding there, not exalt yourselves or villify others.[222] May you exhort yourselves continually, ever mindful that you turned away from millions of former buddhas.[223] (135)

"Abandon your craving for body and life; indifferent, apply yourself to the Dharma,[224] generating ardent respect. I have taught the proper behavior in this *sūtra.* Enlightenment will not be difficult to obtain in the future for those abiding in it. (136)

"The disciplined are delighted in this vehicle of the Victors. When the undisciplined hear about it,[225] they will become extremely dejected. Therefore, you should apply yourself earnestly in this teaching lest you are haunted by regret in the future when you go astray." (137)

[Conclusion: In Praise of the Text]

Should, Rāṣṭrapāla, a bodhisattva, on the one hand, train in the five perfections or, on the other, accomplish his aim through the practice of this discourse on Dharma, [thinking,] "I will discipline myself in it; I will es-

tablish myself in its observance,"[226] the former quantity of merit would not reach even one one-hundredth part of the latter quantity of merit, nor even one one-thousandth part, nor even one one-hundred-thousandth part, nor even one one-hundred-thousand-millionth part, nor even a *saṃkhyā*th part; nor would it permit any calculation[227] or any comparison, or any likeness, or any measurement. Moreover, when this discourse on Dharma was being taught to thirty billions of beings, including gods, men, and *asura*s, aspirations to unexcelled, complete and perfect enlightenment were generated that had not been formerly produced; and they became irreversible in the unexcelled, complete and perfect enlightenment. Also, the minds of seven thousand monks, no longer clinging, were freed from the depravities.

Then the venerable Rāṣṭrapāla said to the Blessed One: "What is the name of this discourse on Dharma? How shall I remember it?" Having thus spoken, the Blessed One said to the venerable Rāṣṭrapāla: "Remember it as 'the pure, unfailing promise'; [60] remember it as 'the disquisition on the training of the bodhisattva, the sport of virtuous men'; remember it as 'the fulfillment of meaning.'"[228]

So spoke the Blessed One. Delighted, the venerable Rāṣṭrapāla, along with the whole world, including the gods, men, *asura*s, and *gandharva*s, applauded what was taught by the Blessed One.

Thus is finished the king of jewels, the *sūtra* on the former deeds of the virtuous man Puṇyaraśmi.

The Mahāyāna *sūtra* called the Noble *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā* is complete.

Notes

Introduction

1. I use the term "Mainstream" here (with a capital "M") and throughout this study to signify those Buddhists who were affiliated with one of the classical monastic lineages *(nikāya)* and whose putative spiritual goal was arhatship. This usage, championed by Paul Harrison, has itself increasingly become mainstream.

2. Cf. the recent remarks by Paul Williams: "Mahāyāna is very diverse. It is united perhaps solely by a vision of the ultimate goal of attaining full Buddhahood for the benefit of all sentient beings (the 'bodhisattva ideal') and also (or eventually) a belief that Buddhas are still around and can be contacted (hence the possibility of an ongoing revelation). To this extent the expression 'Mahāyāna' is used simply for practical purposes. It is used as a 'family term' covering a range of not necessarily identical or even compatible practices and teachings" (2000, 103).

3. For a detailed example of just such a possible variation in monastic attitudes based on regional differences, see Schopen 1994b.

4. Shipps 1987, 78. See also Arrington and Bitton [1979] 1992, 28: "In a manner commending itself to the general restorationist position of the primitive gospelers, the Mormons claimed that the true church of Christ, which had been taken from the church as a result of apostasy and corruption, was now again on the earth."

5. The term "Mahāyāna" actually occurs rather infrequently in much of Mahāyāna *sūtra* literature. It appears, for example, but a single time in the *Rāṣṭrapāla.* Jan Nattier has recently suggested that we would do well to avoid the term in favor of the more common self-appellation "bodhisattva" to refer to this movement (2003, esp. 10–11). There is considerable merit in this suggestion. I will continue to use the term "Mahāyāna" as a shorthand for the collection of movements centered around the bodhisattva orientation but without any assumption of the great versus small vehicle polemic that is present in only some texts of this genre.

6. Givens 2002, 185–208.

7. I will often refer to the composers of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* in the plural. I will show in Chapter 6 that there can be no doubt that the Indic text as we have it acquired its final form in stages, stages that may have spanned hundreds of years and involved an indeterminate number of contributors and editors.

8. Joseph Smith also incorporated passages from the King James Bible into the Book of Mormon with slight modifications. See Arrington and Bitton [1979] 1992, 30–31 (which includes a comparison of several passages).

9. See Hatch [1989] 2001, 123–136.

10. *Book of Mormon,* 2 Nephi 28: 12–13 (cited in Hatch [1989] 2001, 127).

11. *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā-sūtra* (Finot 1901), 34.10–11. Hereafter cited as *RP.*

12. Cf. Givens 2002, 224–225: "It is essential to point out that for present-day Mormons, personal revelation *is* circumscribed by principles of ecclesiastical stewardship or jurisdiction. In early church history, Hiram Page claimed revelations through a seer stone and was instructed in a precedent-setting reproof that only the president of the church is entitled to receive revelation for the church as a whole. 'For behold, these things have not been appointed unto him, neither shall anything be appointed unto any of this church contrary to the church convenants. For all things must be done in order,' he was told [D&C 28:12–13]. And sixth church president Joseph F. Smith officially declared that members' 'visions, dreams, tongues, prophecy, impressions, or any extraordinary gift or inspiration' must be in 'harmony with the accepted revelations of the church [and] the decisions of its constituted authorities,' and pertain only to 'themselves, their families, and . . . those over whom they are appointed and ordained to preside.' "

13. For an overview of some of the more influential voices of dissent in the Mormon tradition, see Launius and Thatcher 1994.

14. See Nattier 2003, 11–14 and n. 3, for a convincing hypothesis on the process of "sūtrafication," by which the discourse of an individual monk may have come to embody the genre-specific features of a *sūtra* as its advocates made increasingly authoritative claims concerning its authorship.

15. M. Weber 1946, 267. It is telling that the only study—a preliminary one at that—to look at the Mahāyāna in sociological perspective was attempted by a scholar of the English Quakers (Kent 1982). This is, to say the least, a sign of how much there is left to do in this area.

16. The beginnings of what such criteria might look like or how some of these questions might be explored can be found in Nattier 2003, 63–72.

17. Harrison 1993, 139–140; 1995, esp. 55–56. See also the remarks in Nattier 2003, esp. 11–16.

18. Dating Mahāyāna *sūtras* on the basis of the date of their Chinese translation is not the only defective principle operating in Mahāyāna scholarship today. Privileged status is often assigned to early manuscripts as well, for example, the corpus found at Gilgit in the early twentieth century. But as scholars of classics and Biblical criticism have long recognized, this too may be an illusory advantage: "A codex of the sixth century may be the copy of a good second century manuscript which has been lost but which was a first-hand copy of the original. A fourth-century codex could be a poor copy of a defective third-century manuscript with a dozen intermediaries separating it from the original. It would therefore be wrong to trust the latter more than the former" (Vaganay and Amphoux 1991, 63).

19. Finot 1901. For a review of Finot's edition, see La Vallée Poussin 1903. My revisions of Finot's edition based on my own reading of the Cambridge MS are contained in the notes to my translation.

20. Itō 1938 and 1940; de Jong 1967, 3–4.

21. Ensink 1952, 60–125.

22. Work on the recensional history of *Kanjur* texts has made rapid advances in recent years, due notably to the work of scholars such as Helmut Eimer and Paul Harrison. For an overview of the significance of this work, see especially Eimer 1992; Harrison 1992c and 1992b, xvi–lviii.

23. These Tibetan recensions can be located as follows: Stog Palace, vol. 38 *(ṅa),* 411b5–455a5, and London, vol. 4 *(ṅa),* 265a5–298b1.

24. Itō 1938, 4.

25. See de Jong 1967, 3, n. 3.

26. *Chu sanzang ji ji* 出三藏記集, T 2145, 55: 7c.

27. Preliminary remarks were made in Boucher 2001.

28. Their biographies can be found in *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* 續高僧傳, T 2060, 50: 433b–434c and 434c–436b respectively. Chavannes (1905) translated the biography of Jñānagupta, whose name he reconstructed as Jinagupta.

29. It may be possible to pinpoint the date of their translation somewhat more precisely. We know from the catalogue compiled by Daoxuan in 664, the *Da Tang neidian lu* 大唐內典綠 (T 2149, 55: 277a), that this scripture was translated by Jñānagupta and Dharmagupta during the Sui dynasty, and Jingtai's catalogue, the *Zhongjing mulu* 眾經目綠 of approximately the same time, confirms that it took place during the Kaihuang reign period (581–600) (T 2148, 55: 182c.19–20). But their translation is not known to several late Sui catalogues: Fajing's *Zhongjing mulu* 眾經目綠 (T 2146) of 594; Fei Changfang's *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶紀 (T 2034) of 597; or Yancong's *Zhongjing mulu* 眾經目綠 (T 2147) of 602. And it should be pointed out that Fei Changfang knows of thirty-one other texts by Jñānagupta translated as late as 595 (49: 103b–104a). In light of this circumstantial evidence, we can hypothesize that their translation was completed in all likelihood in the very last years of the sixth century. Okamoto 1979, 70, n. 2, has a slightly different account of this data.

30. The date for this translation is established in the Song catalogue the *Dazhong xiangfu fabao lu* 大中祥符法寶綠 (*Zhonghua dazangjing* no. 1675); see Okamoto 1974, 155.

31. Sen 2002, 45–46, and 2003, 122.

32. See Brough 1964 on the pseudo-translation of the *Jātakamālā* of the Northern Song dynasty (960–1127) and Bowring 1992 for an attempt to explain the reasons behind this stark decline in translation competence. More recently, one should consult the thorough treatment of the Song translators in Sen 2002.

33. To the best of my knowledge, the *Rāṣṭrapāla* does not appear in any Central Asian language. It is extant in one other Inner Asian language, namely, Mongolian (which is itself a translation from the Tibetan). I should also note that this Mahāyāna *sūtra* is not related to the short *Rāṣṭrapāla-sūtra* from the *Madhyamāgama,* for which we have Sanskrit fragments from Central Asia; see Waldschmidt 1980. Waldschmidt's attribution of a separate translation of this text (T 69) to Dharmarakṣa (360, n. 8) seems merely to be a mistaken back translation of the tenth-century translator's name (Faxian 法賢, probably reflecting something like Dharmabhadra). The *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā-sūtra* studied here is also not the same as the so-called "Minor *Rāṣṭrapāla-sūtra*" edited

and translated by Ensink (1952, 126–138). Mochizuki 1999 points out that there appears occasionally to have been some confusion between these two texts among later commentators and compilers of anthologies.

34. Winternitz [1912–1920] 1983, 319.

35. See Edgerton [1953a] 1985 (Grammar), 1–14.

36. Warder [1970] 1980, 359.

37. Paul Williams has made a similar argument with regard to another Mahāyāna *sūtra,* the *Ajitasena-vyākaraṇa-nirdeśa,* known only from a manuscript discovered at Gilgit and fragments from Central Asia (edited and translated in Rasmussen 1995). See Williams 1989, 26–28. As suggested above, the very criteria urged by one scholar for a text's great antiquity can appear to another as indicators of lateness. Personally, I'm inclined to see the *Ajitasena* as the local product of Kashmiri Buddhism. Some of its unusual views may reflect a Buddhism uninformed by broad contact with more mainstream centers of the tradition. The lack of either a Tibetan or a Chinese translation also suggests that this *sūtra* did not circulate widely.

38. See Adikaram 1946, 97–100.

39. Most recently, Walser (2005) has attempted to place the Mahāyāna—specifically Nāgārjuna—in the Andhra region around Dhānyakaṭaka (modern Amarāvatī) at the end of the second century. His argument is based entirely on circumstantial evidence, however, requiring the acceptance of a number of yet to be demonstrated hypotheses. At the other end of the subcontinent, David Ruegg (2005) has seen what he believes may be "Mahāyāna-type thinking" in the Kalawān copper-plate inscription from Taxila. The fact that the inscription records a gift dedicated to the Sarvāstivādins is not in itself problematic for this thesis. But Ruegg's assumption that the expressed hope that all beings will thereby attain *nirvāṇa* (if in fact this is what the text of the inscription intends, which is not clear) is characteristic of early Mahāyāna thought—or any Mahāyāna thought—strikes me as more problematic. This assumption rests on the equation of the goals of *nirvāṇa* and *anuttara(buddha)jñāna,* only the latter of which is typical of Mahāyāna inscriptions (on which see Schopen 1979).

40. In addition to Ensink's translation of 1952, the Sanskrit *RP* has been translated into modern Japanese by Sakurabe Hajime (1974).

41. Reviews of Ensink's translation can be found in de Jong 1953, Edgerton 1953b, Ch'en 1954, and Shackelton Bailey 1954. The overall conclusions of these reviewers point to the desirability of a new translation of this important work.

Part I. Asceticism and the Glorification of the Buddha's Body

Chapter 1: The Physiognomy of Virtue

1. Harrison 2004, 182.

2. Vernant 1989, 28–29: "To designate nobility of soul, the generosity of hearts of the best of men, the *aristoi,* the Greeks used the phrase *kalos kagathos,* underlining the

indissolubility of physical beauty and moral superiority. The latter can be evaluated only through the former." The same was true for Latin authors, both pagan and Christian: "Finally, my sources exhibit both a healthy suspicion of false appearances as well as a tendency to demonstrate or depict superior character by attractive and even extraordinary appearance. Thus the soul and body are in a dynamic, mutually dependent relationship" (Shaw 1998, 43).

3. Note, for example, *Manusmṛti* 11.48: "Some wicked men undergo a calamitous change of appearance on account of evil deeds committed in this life and some on account of acts committed in former lives" (*iha duścaritaiḥ kecit kecit pūrvakṛtais tathā* | *prāpnuvanti durātmāno narā rūpaviparyayam* || cited in Lariviere 1996, 169 [my translation]). This passage in Manu goes on to list a series of repercussions that befall the evil doer: a man who steals gold gets bad nails, a man who steals grain loses a limb, an adulterer suffers swollen limbs, and so forth; see Olivelle 2005, 845–846 (Skt. text) and 217 (English translation), and also Rocher 1980 on the complexity of Manu's system of retribution. Traditional Indian medical treatises also discuss a similar karmic etiology of disease and bodily deformity; see Weiss 1980.

4. There are a number of biographical accounts of the Buddha's birth, including the first chapter of Aśvaghoṣa's *Buddhacarita* (Johnston [1936] 1984), perhaps our earliest complete biography, and chapter seven of the *Lalitavistara* (edited by Lefmann 1902 and more recently by Hokazono 1994; trans. Foucaux [1884] 1988 and Goswami 2001). Episodes of the Buddha's biography are also scattered throughout both the *Sutta-piṭaka* and the *Vinaya-piṭaka* and have been studied in some detail by André Bareau; on the circumstances surrounding the Buddha's extraordinary birth, see especially Bareau 1962 and 1974 (both are reprinted in Bareau 1995).

5. In the *Pārāyanavagga* (*Sutta-nipāta* V), vv. 999–1003 (trans. Norman 2001, 129), we see a discussion in which a brahmin asks how a buddha can be so identified. The Buddha responds by stating that the marks of a superhuman, already described in the Vedic mantras, adorn the limbs of only two persons: a universal monarch, who remains in the householder's state, and a fully enlightened buddha, who has gone forth from the household. On the antiquity of the *Pārāyanavagga,* see Lévi 1915; Jayawickrama 1948 and 1951; Norman 2001, xxxi–xxxiii; for a somewhat contrary view, see Vetter 1990, esp. 38–42. It is worth noting that these verses of the *Pārāyanavagga,* specifically vv. 976–1031, are not commented upon by the canonical *Cullaniddesa,* "which possibly means that they did not exist at the time of the composition of Nidd II, or were perhaps not regarded as being an authentic part of the text at that time" (Norman 2001, 359).

6. The *Lakkhaṇa-sutta* is *sutta* no. 30 in the *DN* (III, 142–179). Other complete lists of the marks include the *Mahāpadāna-sutta,* listing the marks of the Buddha Vipassī/Vipaśyin (*DN* II, 16–19; in the Chinese translation of the *Dīrghāgama,* T 1, 1: 5a.26–5c.18; also in the *Mahāvadāna-sūtra,* preserved in Central Asian Sanskrit manuscripts; see Waldschmidt 1956, 6b.1–6b.49 [pp. 101–113], and Fukita 2003, 76–86), and the *Brahmāyu-sutta* (*MN* II, 136–137). The latter passage can also be found in Zhi Qian's early-third-century translation *Fanmoyu jing* (T 76, 1: 883c.22–884a.10) and

in the late-fourth-century translation of the *Madhyamāgama* (T 26 [161], 1: 686a.24–c.17). On the latter translation, see also Chau 1991, 306–312.

7. *DN* III, 142–179.

8. Burnouf 1852, appendix VIII, 553–647. On the African origins thesis, see most recently Lopez 2005a, 16–17.

9. Senart 1882, 87–160.

10. A number of scholars have noted that some of these auspicious marks appear to have become part of the standard repetoire for plastic media when the Buddha came to be represented artistically in human form; see Foucher 1905, 607–611, and 1918, 284–312. For a discussion of the continuities and discontinuities between the literary and art historical sources in understanding certain of these marks, one may consult Coomaraswamy 1928 and Myer 1986, esp. 129–131. But Krishan (1966) has taken issue with the attempts to match the literary representations of the *lakṣaṇa* with the iconography of Buddha images: "Much of the controversy and confusion regarding the uṣṇīṣa and the iconological peculiarities in the Buddha sculptures arise from the fact that various scholars have tried to interpret them in light of the mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇas. But, as we shall presently show, the mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇas are not usually represented in the sculptural representation of the Buddha or of cakravartin" (286–287). On the long scholarly debate about the status of the *uṣṇīṣa* in particular, see Lopez 2005a, 20–33.

11. *MN* II, 134.15–18: *āgatāni kho, tāta Uttara, amhākam mantesu dvattiṃsa mahāpurisalakkhaṇāni, yehi samannāgatassa mahāpurisassa dve va gatiyo bhavanti anaññā.*

12. *MN* II, 135. Doubts concerning these two marks recur at several other places in canonical texts, including the *Ambaṭṭha-sutta* (*DN* I, 105–107; *DĀ,* T 1, 1: 87c.13–18) and the *Sela-sutta* (*MN,* no. 92 = *Sutta-nipāta* III, no. 7; Norman 2001, 69–76); see the long note in Lamotte 1944–1980 I, 275–276, n. 1. One might wonder why no doubt seems to have been expressed concerning the Buddha's exquisite sense of taste, also one of the thirty-two marks (Pāli *rasagga-s-aggin;* Skt. *rasarasāgravān,* cf. *BHSD* 453–454). The *Lakkhaṇa-sutta* explains: "He has the most excellent sense of taste; his taste buds, which are located in his upper throat, convey [flavors] uniformly" (*DN* III, 166: *rasaggasaggī hoti, uddhaggassa rasa-haraṇiyo gīvāya jātā honti samabhivāhiniyo;* I read *samābhivāhaniyo* with the Burmese mss. I am not at all clear as to the significance of *uddhagga* in this line). The Buddha's tongue and penis are singled out in all probability because they constituted marks that, although normally hidden, could be visually confirmed, however extraordinary the means, thereby offering Buddhist authors clichéd opportunities to demonstrate the Buddha's attainment to outsiders. Gethin sees the thirty-two superhuman marks described in the Pāli canon as endowing a subtle body "developed over many aeons by the practice of the perfections" (1998, 232), but as Egge rightly points out (2003, 205, n. 16), there is nothing in the relevant Pāli *sutta*s to suggest that they are anything other than features of the Buddha's physical body.

13. For a standard list of the thirty-two *lakṣaṇa,* see most recently Strong 2001, 42. Edgerton includes a long article on the *lakṣaṇa,* together with extensive references to both Mainstream and Mahāyāna sources; see *BHSD* 458–460. See also Lamotte [1938]

1973, 54*–58*, for lists of both the *lakṣaṇa* and the *anuvyañjana* together with references to these lists in Buddhist literature. On the list of the thirty-two major and eighty minor marks in the *Lalitavistara,* see de Jong 1954 and the supplementary comments in Régamey 1973. Wayman 1957 has some additional information from Tibetan sources. Okada Yukihiro has published a series of studies on the occurrences of the major and minor marks in both Mainstream and Mahāyāna literature; see Okada 1989, 1990, 1991a, 1991b, 1996a, 1996b (I have been unable to see Okada 1990).

14. *Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā* (Conze 1974a), 49–53; see also Conze 1975, 583–587 (translation of major and minor marks in *Aṣṭādaśa* list) and appendix II (657–665, translation of *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā* list). On the differences between the list in the *Aṣṭādaśa* and the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā,* see also Conze 1965.

15. Such scenarios exist in even non-Mahāyāna literature. One of the more amusing of them can be found in the *Aśokāvadāna* (Mukhopadhyaya 1962, 23–27; trans. in Strong 1983, 192–196), which describes an encounter between the monk Upagupta and Māra, the archenemy of the Buddha. In this episode, Upagupta converts Māra to the Dharma. Māra in turn offers him a boon of his choice. Upagupta, who entered the monastic life a hundred years after the Buddha's passing, wishes to see the physical form of the Realized One. Māra agrees to magically embody the Buddha's form but only on one condition: that Upagupta not prostrate himself before Māra out of devotion to the Buddha's awe-inspiring body. Upagupta agrees, and Māra assumes the bodily form of the Buddha, replete with the thirty-two superhuman marks. Upagupta is emotionally overwhelmed by this sight; he falls at Māra's feet in reverence. Māra rebukes him, but Upagupta rejoins: "Just as men bow down to clay images of the gods, so I, seeing you here, wearing the form of the Lord of the World, bowed down to you, conscious of the Sugata, but not conscious of Māra" (Strong 1983, 196). A similar story is recounted between the monk Phussadeva and Māra in a later Pāli anthology, the *Sīhaḷavatthuppakaraṇa;* see Strong 1993, esp. 138.

16. Several versions of this text are extant. The Tibetan translation, the source of my English translation, is available at Sde dge vol. Ca, 241a.1–261b.6: *'Phags pa dri ma med kyis byin pas źus pa źes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo.* There are three extant Chinese translations: the earliest, a third-century version by Dharmarakṣa (T 338, 12: 89b.24–97c.10); a sixth-century translation by Gautama Prajñāruci (T 339, 12: 97c.15–107a.28); and a third version attributed, almost certainly wrongly, to Dharmarakṣa's translation assistant Nie Daozhen (T 310 [33], 11: 556a.3–564b.29). A translation of the latter text, with some elisions, is available in Chang 1983, 73–99.

17. This head-to-toe description of the Buddha's body is parallelled in Hindu sources by foot-to-head eulogies of the bodies of divinities; on this motif see Hopkins 2002, esp. 135–165 (I am indebted to John Strong for this reference).

18. Sde dge vol. Ca, 243b.7–245a.5. The corresponding passage in Dharmarakṣa's third-century translation can be found at T 338, 12.90c.9–91b.1. It is clear that he and his translation committee were working from an Indic text that differed in some significant ways from the Indic original underlying the Tibetan.

19. *SN* III, 120: *yo kho vakkali dhammaṃ passati, so maṃ passati. yo maṃ passati, so dhammaṃ passati.*

20. The classic work on Hindu *darśana* is Eck [1981] 1998; see also Babb 1981 (I am indebted to Harrison 1992a for this latter reference). *Darśana* has a long history in Indian traditions before its fully developed expression in Hindu *bhakti* circles. Gonda (1969) has discussed the power of sight in Vedic literature at some length. Early Buddhist participation in this history has generally gone unnoticed. I might note, for example, a passage in the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* (*DN* II, 140–141) where the Buddha enjoins faithful sons of good family—as well as monks, nuns, lay brothers, and lay sisters—to do *darśana* of and powerfully experience *(dassanīyāni saṃvejanīyāni)* four sacred sites: where the Buddha was born, where he attained enlightenment, where he turned the Wheel of the Dhamma, and where he entered *parinibbāna*. Almost every translation of the text has elided the force of the injunction here. See the discussion of this passage in Schopen 1987a, 194–196. See also most recently on Buddhist *darśan* Sharf 2005, esp. 257–259.

21. And yet, despite this praise of the Buddha's qualities as manifest on his physical body, the text wants also to deconstruct this preoccupation with seeing the Buddha in person. In a turn rather typical of this genre of "sex change" *sūtra*s, the young girl Vimaladattā, besting a string of *śrāvaka*s and bodhisattvas in an ultimate/conventional truth repartee later in the text, says to the bodhisattva Amoghadarśin: "Good sir, as you said before: 'Whichever man, woman, boy, or girl upon whom I cast my gaze in this city, they will all see the form of the Realized One; in this way I should think.' But do you cause them to see the Realized One as his form-body, or do you cause them to see him as his dharma-body? If as his form-body, then this is not the teaching of the Buddha. As the Blessed One said: 'Whoever sees me as form or apprehends me as sound, he is stuck in desire and passion. I say that these people do not see me.' Why is this? When one sees the Realized One as the dharma-body, the dharma-body is in fact invisible. Why? Because the dharma-body of the Realized Ones goes beyond visual cognition and is not able to be seen. Amoghadarśin did not say anything" (Sde dge vol. Ca, 249a.6–b.3). This internal citation by the Buddha occurs in nearly identical form in other canonical sources as well; see the *Aśokadattāvyākaraṇa-sūtra,* Sde dge vol. Ca, 233b.6–234a.1; T 310 (32), 11: 553b.2–5 (Buddhaśānta, trans.) and the *Vajracchedikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* (Conze 1974b), 26 (pp. 56–57). For a similar ambivalence toward the "form" of the Buddha as manifest in the cult of the image in another Mahāyāna text, the *Maitreyasiṃhanāda-sūtra,* see Schopen 2005, esp. 120–127.

22. Beyer 1977 and Harrison 1992a have been among the few scholarly treatments to note the special importance of dreams, visions, and revelations in Mahāyāna discourse. Geoffrey Samuel has made some insightful remarks concerning the tension in the Indo-Tibetan traditions "between the visionary and yogic side of Buddhism, with its recurrent struggle to recreate and maintain the shamanic vision, and the clerical and scholarly side, with its orientation towards the development of the Buddhist community as part of a wider hierarchical social order" (1993, 373).

23. This text has been translated and studied in Harrison 1990.

24. Harrison 1992a, 220–221.

25. Harrison 1990, 68–69 (section 8A); the Tibetan text can be found in Harrison 1978, 68–69 (but see also the text critical supplements to this Tibetan edition in Harrison 1990, 308).

26. See Harrison 1990, 46 (section 4D): "Further, Bhadrapāla, if they possess four dharmas *bodhisattvas* and *mahāsattvas* obtain this *samādhi*. What are the four? They are (1) through desire for this *samādhi* having an image of the *Tathāgata* made, or even just having a picture painted. . . . " I should mention also, parenthetically, that a highly elaborate ritual practice focused upon the *pratyutpanna-samādhi* came to be used extensively in China, particularly in Tiantai and Pure Land circles of the Tang and Song periods. See Stevenson 1996 for a discussion of Fazhao's (d. ca. 820) practice and a translation of his visionary experience on Mt. Wutai, and Stevenson 1995 and Getz 1999 on Zunshi's (964–1032) method that combined Tiantai and Pure Land traditions.

27. Gómez 1996, 71 (vow no. 20). Ashikaga 1965, 14. Not in Müller/Nanjio 1883.

28. Gómez 1996, 79–80. Ashikaga 1965, 25–26; Müller/Nanjio 1883, 27–28.

29. Gómez 1996, 98; Ashikaga 1965, 49; Müller/Nanjio 1883, 56.

30. For references to bodhisattvas being adorned with the auspicious marks of a buddha, see Lamotte [1962] 1976, 3, 127, 175, 181, and 234. For the corresponding passages in the Tibetan translation (the source of Lamotte's translation), see the edition by Oshika 1970, 146.3, 183.23–24, 202.21, 205.3, and 226.8. The corresponding passages in the newly discovered and edited Sanskrit text can be found in Matsunami et al. 2004, 4, 206, 302, 312, and 424.

31. See Lamotte [1965] 1998, 107, 160, and 187–188. The corresponding passages in Kumārajīva's translation (T 642), Lamotte's source text, can be found at 15: 629b.20; 635b.23; 639a.21–22.

32. Even Mainstream sources such as the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* make clear that setting out to produce the marks of a superhuman defines the moment one becomes a bodhisattva. For the Sanskrit text, see Pradhan 1975, 265; also La Vallée Poussin [1923–1931] 1980, T. III, 220–227.

33. In describing the future buddha-field of Pūrṇa, who will become the future Buddha Dharmaprabhāsa, we find at KN 202.5–7: *sarve ca te sattvā aupapādukā bhaviṣyanti . . . suvarṇavarṇaiḥ samucchrayair dvātriṃśadbhir mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇaiḥ samalaṃkṛtavigrahāḥ* (And all of these sentient beings will be spontaneously born [in this field] . . . with golden-colored bodies, having bodies adorned with the thirty-two marks of the superhuman.). Note, interestingly, that this reference to golden-colored bodies and the thirty-two marks of the *mahāpuruṣa* is missing from the Kashgar manuscript of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* (Chandra [1976] 1977, folios 193a.7–b.1; Toda 1981, 100).

34. In the first of twelve great vows, the Buddha Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūrya-prabharāja declares: "May all sentient beings be well adorned with the thirty-two major marks and eighty minor signs of a superhuman; just as I am, so too may all beings be like this." Stog vol. 72 (źa), 269a.6–b.1: *sems can thams cad skyes bu chen po'i mtshan sum cu rtsa gñis daṅ | dpe byad bzaṅ po brgyad cus legs par brgyan par gyur te | bdag ci 'dra ba bźin du sems can thams cad kyaṅ de daṅ 'dra bar gyur cig ces btab bo.* Both of the most complete Sanskrit manuscripts of this text from Gilgit are incomplete at this point in the vows, although one recension contains nearly the whole of the first vow; Dutt has attempted a partial reconstruction on the basis of the Tibetan (Dutt 1939 [1984], vol. 1,

3). Xuanzang's nearly contemporaneous Chinese translation (T 450, 14: 405a.7–10) is almost identical with the Tibetan; for a complete translation of this text, see Birnbaum [1979] 1989, 151–172.

35. In chapter 4 of the *Karuṇāpuṇḍarīka-sūtra,* King Araṇemin lists a series of qualities of his future buddha-field, a field he will purify in the course of his bodhisattva training under the Buddha Ratnagarbha. Among these qualities he vows: "May all sentient beings be adorned with the thirty-two marks of the superhuman" (Yamada 1968, 107.14–15: *sarvasattvāś ca dvātriṃśadbhir mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇaiḥ samalaṅkṛtāḥ syuḥ*). Slightly later in the same chapter, as the various sons of Araṇemin receive their own predictions to buddhahood, we find a nearly identical vow concerning the buddha-field of prince Aṅgaja, the future Buddha Prabhāsavirajaḥ-samucchraya-gandheśvararāja: "May all sentient beings, however many there are, be endowed with the thirty-two marks of the superhuman" (Yamada 1968, 145.2–4: *yathā yāvat sarvasattvā dvātriṃśadbhir mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇaiḥ samanvāgatā bhaveyuḥ*).

36. A fuller discussion of the sectarian nature of the the early Mahāyāna is included at the end of Chapter 4.

37. Stog vol. 39 (Ca) 5b.1–4. The *Ugraparipṛcchā* is also available in three Chinese translations: T 322 (An Xuan), T 323 (Dharmarakṣa), and T 310 [19] (attributed, almost certainly wrongly, to Saṅghavarman). The passage cited above can be found in these translations as follows: T 322, 12: 15c.21–16a.1; T 323, 12: 23b.26–29; T 310 [19], 11: 472c.22–25. The whole text has recently been translated and carefully studied in Nattier 2003.

38. *RP* 2.16–17. See the complete translation in Part 3 for a fully annotated version of this and subsequent passages, including proposed emendations to the Sanskrit text.

39. *RP* 3.1–6.

40. An impressive start to understanding light imagery in Mahāyāna literature can now be found in C. Weber 2002, which came to my attention too late to be fully incorporated here.

41. Harrison 1995, 51, n. 1.

42. Skilling 1992 and 1996 has an extensive list of references, culled from Sanskrit, Pāli, and Tibetan sources, to symbols such as wheels and lotuses that occur on the hands and feet of buddhas and bodhisattvas in Buddhist literature. These symbols are in addition to the classic lists of the thirty-two *lakṣaṇa* and eighty *anuvyañjana* referred to above.

43. *RP* 6.13–7.10.

44. *RP* 46.13–47.16.

45. Such reactions are by no means restricted to Mahāyāna *sūtra* literature. James Egge has recently examined a variety of narratives within the Pāli canon describing the affective response to gazing upon the Buddha's body, especially in the *Apadāna*s (Egge 2003). But Egge seems incredulous in the face of what the texts themselves clearly want to suggest: "But how is it that Gotamī, an *arhat* who realizes the truth of impermanence, can desire and worship the Buddha's body at all? Clearly, in these *Apadāna* stories the Buddha's body with its marks stands for transcendent realities; in seeing or touching his body

one gains a nondiscursive awareness of buddhahood, *nirvāṇa,* and the dharma" (196). It seems not to have occurred to Egge that some members of the Buddhist tradition regarded the Buddha's body as capable of eliciting a powerful emotional response that was in itself efficacious for spiritual maturation. These signs do not necessarily point to anything transcendent at all. Nor are they objects of desire in the ordinary sense. In the *Gotamī-apadāna,* the source of Egge's comments, Gotamī asks the Buddha to reveal his lustrous body in the context of her request to enter final *nirvāṇa* (clearly paralleling the similar episode of the Buddha's *parinirvāṇa* in the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*). This achievement was made possible, according to the text, by Gotamī's encounter with the former Buddha Padumuttara, to whom she provided alms and service. Even in this Theravādin context, Gotamī's spiritual accomplishment appears to have resulted from something akin to a bodhisattva path, including a prediction from a former buddha. I will have more to say about the parallels between the *Apadāna*s and related genres of Mainstream literature and Mahāyāna *sūtra*s in Chapter 2.

46. *RP* 50.9–51.8.

47. This view is echoed in many other Mahāyāna *sūtra*s as well, including those, such as the *Sukhāvatī-vyūha,* that are not usually associated with an ethos of asceticism. Note, for example, the following verse from the larger Sanskrit version: "By honoring former Victors, the Self-Existent Ones, and training in immeasurable millions of vows and austerities *[vratatapakoṭi],* the best of beings endeavored to fulfill the power of his vows, a most excellent mass of gnosis" (Ashikaga 1965, 22, v. 9; this verse differs in several respects from that edited in Müller/Nanjio 1883, 24).

48. The emission of light rays from the Buddha's glorified body stands in stark contrast to the more typical view of bodily emissions in the classical Indian world. Brahmanical ideology in particular was preoccupied with polluting contact at the boundaries of the body that threatens its integrity and its relationship to the social world. Ascetic praxis in both brahmanical and Buddhist circles, by contrast, devalued the body as inherently polluted (see Olivelle 1992, esp. 75–78 and 1995, esp. 17–26). By characterizing the Buddha's long practice of austerities as central to his accomplishment, the authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* participated in these traditional ascetic formulations: the Buddha's bodhisattva career effectively reversed the process of physical degradation, drying up the outflows from his orifices, thus creating a radiant, purified body.

49. *RP* 54.13–22.

50. Strong 2001, 31.

Chapter 2: Former Life Narratives and the Bodhisattva Career

1. Walters 1997.

2. Buddhaghosa reports, for example, that the *Dīgha-bhāṇaka*s did not include the *Apadāna, Buddhavaṃsa,* or *Cariyāpiṭaka* in their recitation of the canon; see Norman 1983, 8–9, and Cutler 1994, 20–21.

3. Again, see Norman 1983, 77–84. There is no basis, however, for Reynolds' claim

that "[t]he *jātaka* tradition in Buddhism is very ancient, extending back—in all probability—to the lifetime of the 'historical' Buddha himself (somewhere between the sixth and fourth centuries B.C.E.)" (1997, 20). Cf. also in this regard Basham 1981, 54, n. 10: "There seems no need to repeat the arguments in favor of the comparative lateness of the *Jātaka* collection, and few scholars would now follow such pioneers as Rhys Davids, who in his *Buddhist India* cheerfully used material even from the prose *Jātaka* as relevant to the time of the Buddha and the two following centuries."

4. Walters 1997, 162.

5. Walters notes that most scholars who have considered early post-Aśokan Buddhist history have done so without attention to the *Apadāna, Buddhavaṃsa,* or *Cariyāpiṭaka,* preferring instead to reconstruct the hagiography of the Buddha on the basis of texts generally believed to be much later (1997, 162–163). My own survey of the secondary literature essentially confirms this observation.

6. Barua 1946, 183; and Bechert 1992, 102.

7. Cutler 1994, 28–29. Jonathan Walters sees in the cosmicized hagiography of the *Buddhavaṃsa* and *Cariyāpiṭaka* an attempt to portray the Buddha's bodhisattva career as paradigmatic for all Buddhists (1997, 166), but these texts fall quite short of this. In the concluding verses to the *Cariyāpiṭaka,* which Walters highlights, there is a clear demarcation between the Buddha's enumeration of his own path to supreme awakening in the first five verses and the final three verses, where the Buddha enjoins *(buddhānusāsanī)* his followers to be steadfast, noncontentious, and diligent in the eightfold path. In other words, there is nothing out of the ordinary here from an orthodox Theravādin point of view.

8. Gregory Schopen has recently suggested that the art historical evidence as well indicates that "there can be very little doubt that both the cult of images and the cult of the Bodhisattva came out of the established monastic orders and had nothing to do with the Mahāyāna" (2005, 113). There is also evidence from the anthropology of modern Theravādin groups that the bodhisattva path could be viewed as a legimate goal, at least among some marginal, *dhutaṅga* monks. I will discuss some of these phenomena in Chapter 4.

9. It has until quite recently been a virtually unchallenged article of faith in Buddhist studies that literary tendencies reflecting a developing cult of the Buddha—as well as art historical and epigraphical evidence for its actual practice—must have been the doing of lay adherents of Buddhism despite the considerable evidence to the contrary in numerous monastic sources. Only in the last two decades are we seeing the dismantling of this two-tiered model, largely due to the work of Gregory Schopen. See esp. Schopen 1988/1989 for a discussion of this two-tier assumption and its pernicious effect on our ability to recognize the predominant role of monks and nuns in Buddhist cult practice.

10. Gregory Schopen (1991) has called special attention to the reluctance of scholars to make full use of the art historical, archeological, and epigraphical evidence in constructing histories of Buddhism even though the material culture remains are as extensive as and have been available to scholars for at least as long as the literary remains.

11. The scholarship on these and other sites is extensive, and a full accounting of it is beyond the scope of this chapter. I will therefore note only some of the more impor-

tant works. For a general overview of *jātaka*s in Indian Buddhist art, see Nagar 1993, which distinguishes the scenes according to the figures represented therein. For Sāñcī, in addition to the three-volume study by Marshall et al. 1940, see Sugimoto 1968, which deals with the *jātaka* stories depicted on the Sāñcī gateways. For the over three dozen *jātaka* scenes identified on the railing around the main *stūpa* at Bhārhut, the classic study remains Cunningham [1879] 1962, esp. 48–82; Cunningham's discussion was augmented and qualified in Hultzsch 1912. See also Lüders 1941 for an even fuller treatment of the Bhārhut scenes and their relationship to Buddhist literature. The *stūpa* remains from Amarāvatī in modern Andhra Pradesh have received considerable attention since Burgess' studies of the late nineteenth century; most recently, see Knox 1992 for beautiful plates of some of the extant *jātaka* scenes from the site and an extensive bibliography. For the most recent discussion of the remains from Nāgārjunakoṇḍa, see Stone 1994, which includes plates of a number of famous *jātaka* scenes. Among the many sources for ancient Gandhāra, one must begin with Foucher 1905 (pp. 270–289 specifically treat the *jātaka* scenes). Marshall has pointed out, however, that in contrast to the earlier sites in north central India, *jātaka* reliefs are much less common in Gandhāran art than scenes from the historical Buddha's last life (1960, 111). For Ajaṇṭā, descriptions and reproductions of the cave wall paintings of *jātaka* scenes can be found in Yazdani 1930; more recently, the numerous studies by Schlingloff are the most authoritative (esp. Schlingloff 1999 and 2000).

12. Walters 1997, 181, n. 10.

13. Cf. the remarks by Dehejia 1997, 37: "Literary confirmation in support of visual reading should not be a prior condition, or a necessary condition, for visual interpretation. It is disheartening to find art historians themselves privileging the written over the visual, and seeking literary confirmations for artistic readings." Although Dehejia's point, here in response to a critique by Susan Huntington, is well taken, we still need more reflection on what Dehejia means by a reading "strong enough to stand on its own" (1997, 299–300, n. 10). The fragmentary condition of the artistic and literary (not to mention inscriptional) remnants has concealed the complexity of what must have been a rich and diverse set of live religious options. Rather than prioritizing either the literary or the artistic representations of, for example, the *jātaka* narratives found at *stūpa* sites, art historians and Buddhologists would do well to consider both kinds of evidence in concert, albeit with different emphases, and with mutual respect for the respective syntaxes of their "readings."

14. See Dehejia 1990 and 1997 as well as Gill 2000.

15. R. Brown 1997, esp. 64–75.

16. R. Brown 1997, 71.

17. For Hirakawa's extremely influential views on this subject, see Hirakawa 1957, 1963, [1968] 1989/1990, vol. 2, 189–255, and 1990, 262–274.

18. This episode concerning Sumedha's encounter with Dīpaṃkara—the first in Śākyamuni's long list of meetings with former buddhas—can be found in the second chapter of the *Buddhavaṃsa* (trans. in Horner 1975, 9–25) and in the *Divyāvadāna* (Cowell and Neil 1886), 246–253, in the latter as the young brahmin Sumati (trans. in Strong 2002, 19–23), among other places.

19. On the centrality of Buddhist “Pure Lands” for early Indian Mahāyāna, see Nattier 2000, esp. 89–91.

20. It is also possible that *dhīra* here means “wise one.”

21. *Buddhavaṃsa* I, vv. 74–77.

22. *Apadāna* I, vv. 69–71. A translation of the complete *Buddhāpadāna* can be found in Barua 1946, 186–190. These three verses are also found with minor variations at the end of the *Cariyāpiṭaka,* vv. 366–368.

23. There has been some speculation that the text of the *Cariyāpiṭaka* is incomplete, given that it omits mention of three of the perfections recognized in Pāli literature and contains few examples for several of the listed perfections. See the discussion in Horner 1975, vi–vii.

24. These six are generosity *(dāna),* morality *(śīla),* tolerance *(kṣānti),* exertion *(vīrya),* meditation *(dhyāna),* and wisdom *(prajñā).* See, for example, *Mahāvastu* (Senart 1882–1897) III, 226.2, and *Divyāvadāna* (Cowell and Neil 1886) 476.2–5 (I am indebted to *BHSD* 341–342 for these references). On the development of the motif of the six perfections, their appearance in early Mahāyāna *sūtra* literature, and their relationship to other central Buddhist terms, see Hirakawa 1973.

25. The *Mahāvibhāṣa* of the Sarvāstivādin tradition defends a list of four perfections *(dāna, śīla, vīrya,* and *prajñā),* claiming that other contenders could be subsumed under these; see T 1545, 27: 892a.26–c.4; also Hirakawa 1963, 69, and Sugimoto 1986, 17. The *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra* refers to five perfections (KN 332.10, 333.4, and 334.2) but clearly recognizes a tradition with six. The second chapter of the *Lalitavistara* contains a list of seven perfections that includes *mahopāyakauśalya* (“great skill in stratagems”); see Hokazono 1994, 282. 6–7. The *Rāṣṭrapāla* itself makes mention of the five perfections (59.13) as well as the six perfections (21.7) but gives at two places lists that include a seventh, *upāya* (5.16 and 27.14), and at one place a list that includes an eighth, *samādhi* (54.19).

26. For the account of Mahātyāgavat in the *Dazhidu lun,* see T 1509, 25: 151a.15–152a.27 and Lamotte 1944–1980, 2: 755–762. In the *Liu du ji jing,* see T 152, 3: 4a.17–5a.19, and Chavannes [1910–1934] 1962, 1: 30–38 and 4: 90–91.

27. Verse 140 of the “Prologue” alludes to the tale of Jñānavatī, the sixteen-year-old daughter of King Jñānabala. Jñānavatī cut flesh from her own thigh to save the diseased thigh of a monk who was her spiritual preceptor. Jñānavatī is revealed to be a former existence of Śākyamuni, while her father was the bodhisattva Maitreya and her preceptor the Buddha Dīpaṅkara. See *Samādhirāja-sūtra,* chapter 34, Dutt [1939] 1984, vol. 2, pt. 3, 471.7–486.18; a German translation of this chapter can be found in Weller 1973. This chapter also appears as an independent text within the Chinese canon: T 169, 3: 411a–c, where the protagonist is a prince rather than a princess. See also Okada Mamiko 1993 and Durt 1998 for further discussion. The other previous female existence of Śākyamuni referred to in the *Rāṣṭrapāla* is that of Rūpyavatī, who cut off her own breasts to save a woman afflicted with hunger. This story has been discussed at length in Ohnuma 2000b.

28. The use of animals in *jātaka* stories may have been intended to tap into an old theme in Indian religious traditions, going back at least to the Indus River Civilization:

the wild, raw energy of bestial existence manipulated and domesticated for more respectable religious goals. The role of animals in Buddhist literature has yet to be fully explored. A rather superficial survey of some of the themes related to animals in the Pāli *jātaka*s can be found in Chapple 1997. A more substantial discussion is available in Deleanu 2000.

29. My summary is based on the version preserved in Āryaśūra's *Jātakamālā,* chap. 9 (Viśvaṃtara). See Kern 1891, 51–67, for the standard Sanskrit edition (on which one should also now consult Khoroche 1987) and Khoroche 1989, 58–73, for a fluent English translation. My citations below, except where noted, are from Khoroche's translation, upon which I saw little to improve.

30. Kern 1891, 53.14–16; Khoroche 1989, 60.

31. Kern 1891, 56.15–17; Khoroche 1989, 63. Note here that Viśvantara expresses a willingness to perform an act of *dehadāna,* the gift of the body, which is a prevalent theme in many of the other *jātaka*s alluded to in the *Rāṣṭrapāla.* See below in this chapter for further discussion and examples.

32. Kern 1891, 66.24–67.6; Khoroche 1989, 72.

33. The Pāli can be found as Jātaka no. 547, the last of the Buddha's former lives, in Fausbøll's edition ([1896] 1964, 479–596) and is translated most recently in Cone and Gombrich 1977 with extensive introduction and bibliography. A condensed version of the Pāli can also be found in the *Cariyāpiṭaka,* vv. 67–124; translated in Horner 1975, 9–14. For an important textual study of the Pāli *Vessantara-jātaka,* including a contention that some of its verses are very old, perhaps even pre-Buddhist, see Alsdorf 1957. In addition to Āryaśūra's *Jātakamālā,* one can also find Sanskrit versions of the narrative in Kṣemendra's *Bodhisattvāvadāna-kalpalatā* (Das and Vīdyābhūśana 1888–1918, chap. 23) and among the Gilgit manuscripts, edited and translated together with a Tibetan version from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* in Das Gupta 1978 (the Gilgit version has also been recently translated in Lenz 2003, 226–237). For additional references, see Grey 2000, 478–485. The allusion to Sudaṃṣṭra (= Viśvantara) in Gāndhārī occurs in a series of fragmentary *pūrvayoga*s among the British Library scrolls; see Lenz 2003, 157–165.

34. Bacot 1914.

35. The Viśvantara legend appears on its own as *Taizi xudana jing* 太子須大拏經 (The *Sūtra* on Prince Sudāna), T 171, 3: 418c–424a (trans. in Chavannes [1910–1934] 1962, 3: 362–395). It is also found in the *Liu du ji jing* 六度集經 (T 152, 3:7c–11a) and is referred to in the *Pusa benxing jing* 菩薩本行經 (T 155, 3: 119b.6–7) and *Mouzi li huo lun* 牟子理惑論 (T 2102, 52:3c.27–4a.13); on this latter reference see Pelliot 1920, 304–306, and Keenan 1994, 105–110. For studies focusing particularly on the Chinese sources for this legend, see most recently Durt 1999 and 2000 as well as Bokenkamp 2006, which includes discussion of its co-option in Daoist literature.

36. In the Khotanese *Jātakastava,* the Viśvantara legend is alluded to twice: Dresden 1955, 441, vv. 141–143, and 444, vv. 161–163. For the Sogdian version, see Gauthiot 1912. It is also known in Tokharian: Thomas 1989, 16–26.

37. For Sāñcī, see Sugimoto 1968, 203–208; Dehejia 1997, 4–5, 16–18, and so on; and Gill 2000, 41–43. For Mathurā, see Nagar 1993, 170. Knox 1992 has a number of examples from Amarāvatī: 101–103 (pl. 42), 132 (pl. 69), 145–147 (pl. 75), 149–150 (pl. 77), and 154

(pl. 80). For Ajaṇṭā, see most recently Schlingloff 2000, 195–213 (Caves 16 and 17), which includes a comprehensive list of other artistic and literary representations. For a discussion of Gandhāran examples, see Foucher 1905, 283–285 and Marshall 1960, 99.

38. Three events in the Viśvantara narrative are noted by Song Yun in the sixth century during his pilgrimage to Udyāna and Gandhāra: the site where the prince gave up his children; the place where the brahmin whipped the children as he led them away; and the White Elephant Palace, commemorating the generosity of Viśvantara, which led to his exile. Song Yun's travel account is incorporated within the *Luoyang qielan ji* 落陽伽藍記 [A Record of Monasteries in Luoyang]; mention of these sites is found at T 2092, 51: 1019c.20–1020a1; 1020b.21–24; 1021a.17–22. For a complete translation of this record, see Chavannes 1903 (407, 413–414, and 419–420, for these events specifically) as well as Y. Wang 1981 (228, 233, and 238). Xuanzang records a series of *stūpas* on his travels near Puṣkalāvatī that commemorate the places where Sudaṃṣṭra (= Viśvantara) gave away the royal elephant, where the brahmin asked for his wife and children, and where the brahmin beat the prince's children; see T 2087, 51: 881b.8–21 (trans. in Beal [1884] 1981, 1, 111–113, and more recently in Li 1996, 78–79). See also Feer 1899 for a list of *jātakas* encountered by Xuanzang on his journey through the buddhicized landscape of India. And most recently, see Strong 2004, esp. 51–56, on the *jātaka* tales encountered at cultic sites in north India by Chinese pilgrims.

39. The *Vessantara-jātaka* is often both chanted in Pāli and preached in the vernacular in modern Southeast Asia. For the Thai context, see Swearer 1995, 32–35; Skilling 2006, 126–129, on regional versions of the tale; Gabaude 1991, which discusses both objections to and apologies for the Vessantara story in modern Thailand; and McGill 1997, which treats artistic representations in relationship to ritualized recitations of the tale. In Burma, sermons about *dāna* (giving) regularly allude to Prince Vessantara's sacrifice; see Spiro [1970] 1982, 107–108. For Nepal, see Lienhard 1978.

40. Kern 1891, 60.13–16; Khoroche 1989, 66.

41. Kern 1891, 51.24: *na bodhisattvacaritaṃ sukham anumoditum apy alpasattvaiḥ prāgeva caritum* (my translation).

42. Kern 1891, 18–19: *tad evam atyadbhūtā bodhisattvacaryeti tad unmukheṣu sattvaviśeṣeṣu nāvajnā pratīghāto vā karaṇīyaḥ* (my translation).

43. *Milindapañho,* 274–284; trans. Horner 1963–1964, 2: 95–109, and more recently in Nolot 1995, 218–226.

44. *Milindapañho,* 277: *atidānaṃ nāma bhante Nāgasena loke vidūhi ninditaṃ garahitaṃ.*

45. Cone and Gombrich 1977, xxiii. On the same page they continue: "Preoccupation with one's own Enlightenment to the exclusion of concern for others was of course the accusation levelled against the older schools of Buddhism by the new school, Mahāyāna, which developed around the beginning of the Christian era. Mahāyāna Buddhists held that a true Bodhisattva would not attain Enlightenment, and thus achieve release from rebirth, before he had brought all other beings to the same salvation; this is one reason why they gave less emphasis to the historical Buddha." However, the *Rāṣṭrapāla* confirms both the centrality of Śākyamuni's path as a bodhisattva, in-

cluding his birth as Vessantara, as well as the role such a career had as a proper model for contemporary bodhisattvas. Mahāyāna sources in many ways show that the bodhisattva is rightly preoccupied with his own supreme enlightenment precisely because of his compassion for sentient beings. It is as a buddha that he makes opportunities for salvation most readily available.

46. S. Collins 1998, esp. 497–554.

47. On these two modes of Dhamma, see Collins 1998, 419–423. Jonathan Walters has insightfully observed that many modern scholars have read the *jātaka* narratives as ethical paradigms for ordinary Buddhists who, it could be assumed, "would read or listen to or look at a *jātaka* identifying themselves with or taking the subject-position of the Bodhisatta" (2003, 26–27). And yet, as Walters points out, Theravādins almost universally "insist that Buddhas are extremely rare, that as Nāgasena proves to Milinda only one can exist at a time, and that the achievement of Buddhahood requires an effort which in every birth across that vast expanse of time is beyond the capability of any but the most exceptional being" (27). In other words, it is unlikely that any but a few ancient or modern Theravādin (or other Mainstream) Buddhists would have understood Vessantara as a model for their own ethical choices.

48. See Ohnuma 1997, 1998, 2000a, 2000b, 2001, and 2007.

49. My summary and discussion is based on the version found in the *Avadānasārasamuccaya;* the Sanskrit is edited and translated into English on facing pages in Handurukande 1984, 58–87. At least two different versions of this story are known in early Chinese sources, one in the *Liu du ji jing* (T 152, 3: 5a.20–6a.20) and the other in the *Za piyu jing* (T 207, 4: 530a.13–c.12), both translated in Chavannes [1910–1934] 1962, 1: 38–45 and 2: 59–61 respectively. Other variations to the same basic story also exist in these collections. Another version of the story of Sarvaṃdada is known from the *Mahāvastu* (Senart 1882–1897, 3: 250–254; trans. in Jones 1949–1956, 3: 239–242), but it differs in a number of ways from the above accounts. The placement of the events of this story in the sacred geography of Buddhist India is noted by Xuanzang in his travel account (T 2087, 51: 883a; Beal 1884, 1: 124; Li 1996, 86). For additional citations, see Handurukande 1984, 20–23. Ohnuma has written an M.A. thesis on this *jātaka* that I have not been able to consult (Ohnuma 1992).

50. Handurukande 1984, 67, v. 23.

51. Handurukande 1984, 70, v. 40 (my translation).

52. Handurukande 1984, 79, vs. 63 (with modifications).

53. Handurukande 1984, 82, v. 78 (my translation).

54. *kāyād asārād aham adya sāraṃ bhavantam āsādya samujjihīrṣuḥ;* Handurukande 1984, 76, v. 53. On this cliché of "extracting the essence from a worthless body," see Strong 1983, 148–155; Silk 1994, 353–354, n. 1 (where he notes the occurrence of this phrase in both the *Ratnarāśi* and the *Ugraparipṛcchā*); Pagel 1995, 381–382 (contrasting the nonsubstantial physical body of the bodhisattva with the substantial body of the Tathāgata); Nattier 2003, 227–228, n. 120; and Ohnuma 2007, 213–217.

55. Ohnuma 1997, 174.

56. Ohnuma 1997, 175. Ohnuma 1998 also makes a similar connection between

the bodhisattva's gift of his physical body and the Buddha's gift of the dharma, though I fail to see how the Buddha's gift of the dharma constitutes an act of self-sacrifice as she has argued (esp. 345–355).

57. The *Śibi-jātaka* involving the bodhisattva's gift of his eyes can be found, among other places, in Pāli *Jātaka* no. 499 (trans. in Cowell [1895] 1994, 4: 250–256) and *Jātakamālā* no. 2 (Kern 1891, 6–14; trans. in Khoroche 1989, 10–17). The version in which King Śibi offers flesh from his thigh to save a dove (in reality the god Śakra in disguise) from being eaten can be found in the *Pusa bensheng man lun* 菩薩本生鬘論 (T 160, 3: 333b.10–334a.13) and the *Da zhidu lun* (25: 87c.28–89c.27; trans. in Lamotte 1944–1980, 1: 255–260), to mention only two. Parlier 1991 has discussed this narrative in relationship to parallel narratives from brahmanical sources, in particular the *Mahābhārata,* as well as to expressions of the Śibi tale in Buddhist art. Another version of the *Śibi-jātaka* occurs in Jain sources as well; see Granoff 1991, 226 and n. 10. Additional references can be found in Lamotte 1944–1980, 1: 255–256, n. 1, and Grey 2000, 391–397. A comprehensive study of this narrative, including a discussion of its various incarnations in Indian and especially Chinese sources and their relationship to one another, can be found in Meisig 1995.

58. *Xianyu jing* 賢愚經 (T 202), 4: 351c.5–352b.18. The *Xianyu jing* version has been translated into English from the Mongolian in Frye 1981, 9–12; the Mongolian is itself a translation from the Tibetan, which in turn is a translation from the Chinese.

59. I read *fan* 梵 in place of *mo* 魔 with variant in the Song, Yuan, and Ming editions.

60. For a thoughtful discussion of this tension, see Ohnuma 1997, 121–151.

61. Cf. Ohnuma 2000a, 66: "The *jātakas* constitute a Buddha-centered genre that praises and exults in the idealistic deeds of the bodhisattva. In large part, the reader of the *jātakas* is encouraged to worship and show devotion toward the Buddha rather than to imitate him directly."

62. For the initial statement concerning King Śibi, see T 1509, 25: 87c.27–88c.27 (trans. in Lamotte 1944–1980, 1: 255–260). The counterstatement can be found at 25: 92c.12–28 (trans. in Lamotte 1944–1980, 1: 297–298). See also the discussion on this passage in Ohnuma 2000a, 63.

63. Crosby and Skilton 1995, 41–42 (= chap. 5, vv. 86–87).

64. For example, he cites *dehadāna* tales from the *Nārāyaṇaparipṛcchā-sūtra* (*Śikṣ* 21.1–22) and from the *Vajradhvaja-sūtra* (*Śikṣ* 23.13–26.3). In both cases the bodhisattva is called upon to offer of himself whatever is asked to anyone who petitions him, always without hesitation or regret.

65. T 1509, 25: 145a.18–29 (my summary and translation); see also Lamotte 1944–1980, 2: 701–702. I am indebted for this reference to Ohnuma 2000a, 58–59.

66. *Nanhai ji gui nei fa zhuan* 南海寄歸內法傳 [Account of Buddhism Sent Back Home from the Southern Seas], T 2125, 54: 231a.28–c.16.

67. Although Yijing is somewhat obscure here, the point I think is that a monk should not consider violating even a relatively minor precept, let alone something as weighty as taking his own life.

68. The bodhisattva Sarvasattvapriyadarśin's burning his arm is described in chap-

ter 22 of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra* (KN 411.6–415.9). Sarvasattvapriyadarśin, desiring to pay homage to the relics of the recently departed Buddha Candravimalasūryaprabhāsaśrī, lit his own arm on fire before *stūpa*s containing the buddha's ashes as an act of heroic worship. A similar tale is alluded to in the *Rāṣṭrapāla* ("Prologue", v. 123).

69. A clear reference to the story of Viśvantara discussed above.

70. Xianyu 仙預 was one of the Buddha's former lives as a king. According to the *Mahāyāna-Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* (T 374, 12: 434c.8–21), King Xianyu was devoted to the Mahāyāna scriptures. When he heard that five hundred brahmins reviled them, he had them executed. The five hundred brahmins were reborn in hell as a result of their impiety.

71. The story of King Maitrībala can be found in, among other places, *Jātakamālā,* chapter 8.

72. Lists of the four benevolences vary but often include parents, sentient beings, kings, and the Three Jewels; see Nakamura [1981] 1991, 509a–b.

73. In other words, saving lives is praised, not taking them, even one's own.

74. I take Yijing to say here that the more serious infraction, the one requiring expulsion from the *saṅgha (pārājika),* belongs to those who first led others to burn their bodies and then did so themselves.

75. That is, it is not the mistake of the instruments but of the practitioner. I would like to thank Stephen Bokenkamp for clarifying this allusion for me. Wang Bangwei [1995] 2000, 226, n. 3, understands this phrase quite differently, taking it to mean "inducing others to drown themselves." I am at a loss to understand the source of his interpretation.

76. In other words, a fault that is irreversible; see *Foguang da cidian* 2953a.

77. A reference to the *Vyāghrī-jātaka,* also alluded to in the *Rāṣṭrapāla* ("Prologue," v. 115).

78. Refers to the tale of King Śibi; see above in this chapter.

79. It is worth pointing out, however, that this is not always the case. Gregory Schopen has noted on more than one occasion that there are a number of passages in Yijing's travel record that appear to be citations from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya,* not eyewitness reports. See Schopen 1992, 25–26, n. 19, and Schopen 1995b, 119, n. 4. The failure to recognize this has occasionally misled scholars who took these passages as records of actual practice and not as the normative prescriptions they were. See also Barrett 1998, who takes Schopen's point here in some unexpected directions.

80. On the practice of self-immolation among medieval Chinese monks, see Gernet 1960; Jan 1965; and more recently, Kieschnick 1997, 35–50; Benn 1998 and 2001; and Funayama 2002. Chinese monks were also motivated by scriptural precedent, especially the tale of Sarvasattvapriyadarśin in the *Lotus Sūtra* (see Gernet 1960, 536–541, and Benn 2001, 287–331). Nevertheless, this was a matter of considerable debate in Chinese Buddhist circles, often between the priority of Mahāyāna virtues and "Hīnayāna" discipline. Benn has argued convincingly that the apocryphal *Shoulengyan jing* (T 945), which advocates burning the body so as to eliminate karmic defilements, may well have been composed in direct response to Yijing's critique of the practice; see Benn 1998, 312–316.

81. *RP* 27.11–18.

Chapter 3: Wilderness Dwelling and the Ascetic Disciplines

1. Lamotte 1954, 379. Lamotte essentially restated this position in 1958 in his magisterial *Histoire du bouddhisme indien* (pp. 89–90; English trans., 1988, 81–82). I will show in Chapter 4 that the *Rāṣṭrapāla* is not anticlerical but reformist; it is fully situated in a monastic context.

2. Hirakawa 1963, 72–73.

3. Cf. Hirakawa 1957, 167: "According to the *kharoṣṭhī* inscriptions, it is clear that *stūpa*s which did not belong to the Nikāya orders were numerous, and it can be assumed that the locus of the faith and life of the early Mahāyāna adherents was probably found among them. And I think we can consider linking this assumption with the way things must have been at *stūpa*s as indicated in the scriptures above." The problems with this part of Hirakawa's argument have been discussed at length in Sasaki 1995 (Japanese) and 1997 (English), and more recently again in Nattier 2003, 89–93.

4. Relevant works include Hirakawa 1968 (revised in 1989–1990, see esp. vol. 2, 108–255); 1990, 270–274; and 1991.

5. Schopen 1975. For more recent remarks on Hirakawa's thesis and some qualifications of his earlier argument, see Schopen 2004 (esp. 496–498) and 2005 (esp. 153, n. 118).

6. Despite—or perhaps because of—the tremendous influence Schopen's article has exerted on the way we imagine early Mahāyāna sodalities, some scholars have adapted his argument to other purposes, occasionally misreading his fundamental thesis. Gombrich (1990), for example, linked the rise of the Mahāyāna to writing, but in the process he appears to have missed the cultic role of the book as an object that may or may not have had anything to do with reading. Vetter (1994) attempted to resuscitate Hirakawa's thesis of the lay origins of the movement at *stūpa* sites. Not only does this piece rely on the two-tiered model, which presumes that monks could only react to lay innovation, it also periodizes the sources in ways few scholars would today accept. Most recently, Todd Lewis (2000) cites Schopen's 1975 article with regard to the cult of the *stūpa* in Nepal: "In the Mahāyāna schools, the *stūpa* came to symbolize yet other ideas: of the Buddhahood's *[sic]* omnipresence; a center of *sūtra* revelation (Schopen 1975)"; by conflating the terms *stūpa* and *caitya,* Lewis has missed the fundamental strategy of the early Mahāyāna to establish its cultic centers in contradistinction to existing shrines. Lewis' misunderstanding is all the more ironic in that Schopen himself wrote a foreword to his book.

7. Harrison 1995, 65.

8. For various lists of the ascetic disciplines, see Ehara et al. 1961, 27–38; Bapat 1964; Dantinne 1991; and Ray 1994, 292–323. Bapat (1964, xxi) and Ray (1994, 297) suggest that the twelve-member list belongs to Mahāyāna literature while the thirteen-member list became standard in Pāli (i.e., Theravādin) sources. Although there is some truth to this pattern, the situation is somewhat more complicated than that. For example, Dantinne has noted that the Mahāyāna text the *Akṣobhyatathāgatavyūha* has a twelve-member list in one of its Chinese translations (T 310 [6], 11:102b.28–c.2) but a thirteen-member list in its Tibetan translation (1991, 64–66, nn. 29–30; cf. also Dan-

tinne 1983, 87–88), suggesting that the precise formulation of the list remained fluid even within one textual tradition. Moreover, the Chinese *Ekottarāgama-sūtra* (*Zengyi ahan jing* 增壹阿含經, T 125, 2: 557b.8–9) also knows a list with twelve members, indicating that not all Mainstream sources can be contrasted with Mahāyāna traditions.

9. See Dantinne 1991, 5, and Bapat 1964, 5–7, for this list of thirteen, with some variation as to order. The Chinese translation of the *Vimuktimārga* also includes a list of thirteen members (*Jietuo dao lun* 解脫道論, T 1648, 32: 404b.20–406c.20). This text has been linked with the Abhayagiri fraternity in Sri Lanka; it subsequently became lost in Pāli when the Mahāvihāra attained supremacy. For arguments on this affiliation, see Bapat 1964, xxviii–xxix, and Norman 1983, 113–114.

10. See, for example, *Visuddhimagga* (Warren [1950] 1989) 2.39 and Dantinne 1991, 15.

11. Complete lists in Pāli include the *Parivāra* (*Vinaya-piṭaka,* V, 131 and 193), *Milindapañha* (359), *Visuddhimagga,* chap. 2. An alternative and almost certainly earlier list that incorporates the thirteen practices can be found in the *Theragāthā* (vv. 842–865); on this list see Ray 1994, 308–310. They are also discussed in the Pāli *Aṭṭhakathā* literature; see Yabuuchi 2000.

12. T 783, 17: 720b–722a; Dantinne 1991, 8–9. The *Shier toutuo jing* has been recently discovered among the manuscripts at Nanatsu-dera in Nagoya, Japan, and this version differs from that of the standard *Taishō* edition in a number of ways. Enomoto Masaaki 1992 discusses this manuscript in greater detail.

13. Ray 1994, 298.

14. *Visuddhimagga* (Warren [1950] 1989) 2.20–76 (trans. Ñāṇamoli [1975] 1999, 63–77).

15. Ñāṇamoli [1975] 1999, 63.

16. Cf. *Milindapañha* 353: *na mahārāja dhutaguṇesu pubbāsevanaṃ vinā ekissa yeva jātiyā arahattaṃ sacchikiriyā hoti* (There is no realization of arhatship in one lifetime without the former adherence to the ascetic disciplines, Great King).

17. *Milindapañha* 357 (my translation).

18. Ray 1994, 305.

19. Many scholars, Ray included, would like to see the *dhutaguṇa* tradition as representing the original Buddhist lifestyle practiced by the Buddha and his immediate disciplines, a lifestyle that was eventually lost as later generations of monks became increasingly sedentary (see more recently this assumption in Bailey and Mabbett 2003, 161–168). Such scholars may be right. But I would argue that we have no direct evidence for the lifestyle of the Buddha and his earliest followers. We should not, therefore, mistake polemic from later *dhutaguṇa* factions as historical statements of fact.

20. See Lamotte 1944–1980, 2: 868–878, with his typically extensive references. The most thorough analysis of the Devadatta traditions can be found in Mukherjee 1966. Bareau examines the Devadatta narrative from the chapters related to schism in the various *vinaya* (1988–1989, 538–547; 1991). Both Mukherjee and Bareau have been summarized recently in Ray 1994 (162–173), together with Ray's own interpretation of the agenda behind the narratives. The Devadatta cycle can be found in a variety of *vi-*

naya recensions, each with subtle or not so subtle differences. The Pāli, Mahīśāsaka, and Dharmagupta versions are largely in agreement, while the Sarvāstivādin and Mūlasarvāstivādin recensions clearly follow a different and somewhat more developed tradition. My account here follows the Pāli *Cullavagga* (*Vinaya-Piṭaka* II, 184–203; trans. in Horner [1952] 1988, 5: 259–285).

21. For a discussion of the karmic circumstances that made the Buddha vulnerable to such attacks, see Walters 1990.

22. Horner [1952] 1988, 277.

23. Bareau 1988–1989, 544–545, and 1991, esp. 130–132. See also Ray 1994, 170. Ray, however, has a curious way of sliding back and forth between seeing Devadatta on the one hand as a *dramatis persona* manipulated by monastic authors harboring an anti-forest agenda and, on the other, as a historical figure for whom settled monasticism was "not part of his thinking." Without discounting the likelihood that there may in fact have been an historical Devadatta, there can also be little doubt that the "real" Devadatta has largely been lost in the literary machinations of monastic self-aggrandizement. Bareau, for his part, suffers from no such oscillation. He quite innocently accepts the encounter between Devadatta and the Buddha as an historical event.

24. Ray 1994, 172. It is worth noting, however, that the one reference to Devadatta in the *Rāṣṭrapāla* (36.3) is decidedly negative. If Devadatta had been identified with forest reclusion in some Indian Buddhist circles, this association was apparently lost on the authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla,* who themselves are clearly within the forest camp.

25. T 2085, 51: 861a.12–13.

26. T 2087, 51: 928a.22–23.

27. T 1453, 24: 495c.13–20. I am indebted for this reference to Wang Bangwei [1995] 2000, 108–114, and Deeg 1999, 188–191. Deeg provides a complete English translation of the note, which Wang also summarized in an earlier article (1994, 180–181).

28. I am also skeptical of Deeg's attempt to date the appearance of a Devadatta *saṅgha* to the Kushan period (1999, 194 and 199). The evidence he provides is inconclusive.

29. Carrithers 1983, 104.

30. Jg's translation of *pāda*s a and b is rather different: 為求佛說大小乘 教示眾生令入道 (Because I sought buddhahood, teaching the great and small vehicles, [I now] teach sentient beings and cause them to enter the path).

31. *RP* 27.17–18.

32. *RP* 31.13–14.

33. *RP* 31.17–18. There are other stories of bodhisattvas being expelled from towns and kingdoms and forced to dwell in forests in the hinterland. See, for example, chapter 35 of the *Samādhirāja-sūtra* (Dutt [1939–1959] 1984, 2, pt. 3, esp. 490.10–491.8). See also Mitsuhara 1996 on intramonastic tensions between Mainstream and Mahāyāna *bhikṣu*s as reflected in the *Samādhirāja-sūtra.*

34. *RP* 43.14–19.

35. Schuster 1981, 25.

36. Sponberg 1992.

37. Sponberg 1992, 35, n. 29.

38. *Sutta-nipāta,* v. 835. On the earliness of the *Aṭṭhakavagga,* see the studies cited at Chapter 1, n. 5.

39. Sponberg 1992, 21.

40. In this regard it is also worth noting the observations by Gregory Schopen, based on his survey of the inscriptional records of donor activity from the earliest times through the Gupta period: "Although the full details have yet to be worked out, it appears that the appearance or presence of monks calling themselves *śākyabhikṣus* everywhere in the fourth–fifth century C.E. occurs in conjunction with the marked decline or disappearance of the participation of nuns in recorded Buddhist religious activity. The fact that these *śākyabhikṣus* are almost certainly Mahāyāna monks may seem curious, but it appears that the emergence of the Mahāyāna in the fourth–fifth century coincided with a marked decline in the role of women of all kinds in the practice of Indian Buddhism. What is important for us to note here, however, is that until that time—contrary to Oldenberg—nuns, indeed women as a whole, appear to have been very numerous, very active, and, as a consequence, influential in the actual Buddhist communities of early India" (1988/1989, 165). It is worth pointing out that nowhere does the *Rāṣṭrapāla* refer to the order of nuns, either in its injunctions or in its critiques. They are for all intents and purposes invisible within this text.

41. Since Sponberg's article, Liz Wilson (1996) has produced a superb reflection on representations of women, particularly in Buddhist literature from the first half of the first millennium. While her work does not specifically treat Mahāyāna sources at length, many of her insights, especially with regard to the monastic propensity to represent women as mute objects of the male gaze, have much to offer Buddhologists of all periods and genres.

42. Silk 1994. My references to the *RR* are by the section and subsections used by Silk in his edition and translation. Translations are his unless otherwise stated. I should also mention the more recent study and Japanese translation of the *Ratnarāśi-sūtra* in Mitsuhara 2004.

43. *RR* I.2 (47), (56), (58), and (61) (translation slightly modified).

44. Cf. *RR* V.7: "If he is a dweller in the wilderness abode, he should be bound by the vows of the monastic disciplinary rule."

45. On the relationship between these two texts, see esp. the remarks in Silk 1994, 23–25.

46. Skt. *satkṛtyāraṇyavāsaḥ.* The sense of *satkṛtya* here is much stronger than "piously" or "respectfully." The authors intend, I think, to suggest something of a zealous, even fanatical, commitment to life in the wilderness, though, of course, they mean this in a positive sense.

47. See esp. *KP* §§121–126 on the various calibers of *śramaṇa*s.

48. The linking of these four texts into a single subgenre is not merely the result of my own random search through the Buddhist canon. The seventh/eighth-century Indian monk Śāntideva quotes from all four of these texts, together with the *Samādhirāja-sūtra,* in chapter 11 ("Praise of the Wilderness") of his *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (Bendall 1897–1902, 193–201). Thus in some monastic minds within the classical Indian Buddhist world, these texts were explicitly associated with the *āraṇyaka* vocation.

49. In Nattier's translation (2003, 207–321), the practices of the lay bodhisattva oc-

cupy §§1-21 (207-279), while the practices of the monastic bodhisattva are treated in §§22–33 (280–320).

50. Stog Palace MS, vol. 39 (Ca), 24a.3–5 (my translation). The Chinese parallels are as follows: T 322, 12: 19a.21–22; T 323, 12: 27a.10–11; T 310 [19], 11: 476a.23–24.

51. Very similar statements are made in the *Samādhirāja-sūtra;* see, for example, chapter 5, v. 7 (Matsunami Seiren 1975, 790.9–12): *na kaś ci buddhaḥ purimeṇa āsīd anāgate bheṣyati yo 'vatiṣṭhate / yehi sthitair evam agāra-madhye prāptā iyaṃ uttama agra-bodhiḥ //* (There has been no buddha in the past, nor will there be in the future, who abides in the household and who so established has achieved this supreme, highest enlightenment). I am indebted for this reference to Schopen 2000b, 22, n. 45.

52. I borrow this phrase from Richard Robinson's insightful article; see Robinson 1965/1966, esp. 27–30.

53. Stog Palace MS, vol. 39 (Ca), 37a.6–b.6 (my translation). The parallel Chinese translations can be found as follows: T 322, 12: 20c.6–11; T 323, 12: 28c.21–26; T 310 [19], 11: 478b.2–11.

54. See, for example, *RP* 16.3–4 and 7–8; *RR* V.17; and *KP* §36.

55. P. Brown 1971b, 101; see also Brown [1971a] 1989, 110–112, and Le Goff [1985] 1988, 47–59.

56. See among other places *Jātaka* I, 99, for a representative description. However, the forest is also sometimes described in idyllic terms, especially in *jātaka* and *avadāna* literature, as a site that enables the simple lifestyle of the ideal renunciant; on this latter motif see S. Collins 1998, 329–345.

57. See Kamala 1997, esp. 79–105.

58. On wilderness dwelling in the *UP,* see Nattier 2003, 89–96 and 130–131.

59. Such a view of the *Ugraparipṛcchā* has been repeated on numerous occasions by Akira Hirakawa; see among others Hirakawa 1957 and [1968] 1989/1990, vol. 2, esp. 108–187. Western students of the text have also often failed to appreciate the force of its ascetic values. Nancy Schuster (1985) sees in the earliest Chinese translation by An Xuan a version that "extolls the heroic householder *bodhisattva* as superior to the more conventional person who follows the rules—and that seems to mean, especially, the precept-obeying cleric" (39). She sees then a decidedly proclerical bias developing in later translations. This perspective has been repeated in Pagel 1995. In reference to the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*'s espousal of universal salvation, Pagel comments: "Historically, it probably stemmed from the thought contained in several early Mahāyāna scriptures that give prominence to the ideal of the lay *(gṛhapati)* bodhisattva over that of the mendicant *(pravrajita)* bodhisattva. Texts such as the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* and (early versions of the) *Ugraparipṛcchā* provide illustration of this literary strand" (47). More recently, in attempting to find textual support for contemporary Nepalese lay Buddhism, Todd Lewis has also drawn upon the work of Nancy Barnes (= Schuster): "the *Ugraparipṛccha [sic]* extols becoming wealthy as a legitimate—even necessary—vocation, allowing the *bodhisattva* to become a protector of his own household and kin, a community leader who 'take[s] responsibility for the physical and spiritual well-being of all who live in his land, giving Dharma as well as material goods' " (Lewis 2000, 51). It is neither the case that the *Ugraparipṛcchā* in general exalts

the householder bodhisattva—let alone a wealthy one—nor that the earliest Chinese translation by An Xuan represents a different voice with regard to this question. As noted above, all of the passages cited here occur in all versions of the text.

60. T 310 [40], 11: 625c.5–17.

61. Wogihara [1932] 1973, 771–784; trans. in Conze 1973, 230–235.

62. On the list of the *dhutaguṇa*s in the *Aṣṭa,* see Ray 1994, 310–312.

63. Wogihara [1932] 1973, 780–781 (my translation).

64. Douglas [1970] 1982, 118–119.

65. For some insightful observations about the role of Māra in early Mahāyāna literature, particularly in the *Aṣṭa,* see Kent 1982, esp. 318–319.

66. On this score then I would take issue with Karashima's conclusions concerning the attitudes toward wilderness dwellers in the *Lotus Sūtra* (Karashima 2001, esp. 162–170). Karashima cites some verses from the *Utsāha-parivarta* ("Chapter on Exertion") in which the author claims that wilderness-dwelling monks will malign them (i.e., bodhisattvas who preach and support the *Lotus Sūtra*), branding them heretics who produce their own *sūtra*s for their own ends (162–163). Karashima takes this antagonism as a sign that "we may conclude that those who composed and preached the Lotus Sutra were village or village-oriented monks" (165). Without discounting the possibility of a "real" antagonism between different factions of monks, I am more inclined to see such passages as linked to a particular discursive strategy within the text. Rather than aiming to deprecate wilderness monks, who in this passage almost certainly were regarded as of the Mainstream variety, the author instead uses them as a foil by which to elevate his real agenda: promoting the *Lotus* as *buddhavacana* (the word of the Buddha). The uphill battle they faced in this enterprise required an explanation for supporters whose commitment to the cause could have wavered under such abuse.

67. For some earlier canonical contrasts between these kinds of specialists, see La Vallée Poussin 1936/1937 and Ray 1994, 105–178.

68. Tib. *dka' thub kyi mchog daṅ ldan pa;* Skt. *ugratapā(ś),* "fierce austerities."

69. Tib. *mi sgul ba;* Jñānagupta: *bu dong rulai* 不動如來.

70. My translation here is from the Tibetan as edited in Braarvig 2000b, 125–128; only a small part of the corresponding Sanskrit is extant for this passage in the Schøyen MSS (also edited by Braarvig). My translation departs from Braarvig's on many points large and small; on the latter, see Boucher 2002, esp. 251–254.

71. It is difficult to know what to make of the fact that the late-sixth-century monk from Gandhāra Jñānagupta translated both the *Sarvadharmāpravṛtti-nirdeṣa* and the *Rāṣṭrapāla* into Chinese, suggesting that he obtained these texts from a Mahāyāna community that knew them both.

72. See Tambiah 1984, 329–334, for an important qualification of Weber's typology, a qualification essentially confirmed by my sources as well.

73. Silber 1995, 148–149; see also her comments on this pattern and the role of virtuoso radicalism in it, 42–43 and 53–54.

74. *RP* 30.13–16.

75. Ray 1994, 418.

Chapter 4: "Profit and Honor"

1. *Life of Wesley,* chapter 29 (cited from M. Weber 1958, 175).

2. This point has been argued at length in Sharf 1995. While the *Rāṣṭrapāla* would seem to confirm that meditating monks were hard to find in ancient India, Sharf may overstate the case when he says that "the practice of Buddhist meditation, even among the *saṃgha,* is not widely attested in the premodern period" (1995, 253). The problem of locating meditating monks is essentially the same as the historical difficulty of locating wilderness-dwelling monks. Cf. the remarks in Schopen 1995a, 475: "These passages from several different vinayas—and a large number of other passages—make it difficult to avoid the conclusion that if the ideal of the individual rag-wearing, begging, forest dwelling monk was in fact ever the rule in the early history of Indian Buddhism, if the ideal was ever anything more than emblematic, then it was, by the time the vinayas that we have were compiled, all but a dead letter." Rupert Gethin has taken issue with this characterization, suggesting that we would indeed not expect to find the forest tradition well represented in the literature of a sedentary monastic culture, nor would we expect that donations to forest monks are likely to have been recorded in the epigraphical evidence. Nevertheless, the forest ideal, in his words, "has continued to exercise a considerable power over the imaginations of both the Saṅgha and the laity down to the present day" (1998, 105). It is, therefore, not necessarily surprising that our textual sources are frequently quiet with regard to individuals whose practice and lifestyle represented an implicit critique of the orthodox, mainstream tradition.

3. *RP* 29.11–14.

4. *Mahāvaṃsa* 77.3–4 (cited from Carrithers 1979, 298). In addition, Buddhaghosa, in his commentary on the *Saṃyutta-nikāya,* refers to a *samaṇa-kuṭimbika* (ascetic-householder), in this case, a monk who makes his living as a farmer. See von Hinüber 2002, 82.

5. For the text of these records, see Boyer et al. 1920, 149; 1927, 176 and 182–183 respectively. These documents are translated in Burrow 1940. See also the discussion in Atwood 1991, esp. 173–175, and more recently, Ichikawa 1999 and Hansen 2004.

6. There may be yet another window into at least the perception of monastic mores in India outside of Buddhist canonical sources. Degenerate behavior among Buddhist monks was a frequent topos in classical Sanskrit literature; the hypocritical mendicant was a stock character of satire. See Siegel 1987, 209–225 (I thank Jan Nattier for calling this work to my attention). Whether these satirical portraits of Buddhist monastic behavior by brahmanical writers are accurate or not is beside the point. As Siegel notes: "The comic event cannot be comic unless it is, in some sense, real, unless it refers to reality. And yet if it become too real, if the limits of reference are obliterated, it can cease to be comic" (1987, 216). Von Hinüber has also noted references to married monks (including this verse from the *Rāṣṭrapāla*) (2002, 82–83). And he mentions at least one source, the *Prabodhacandrodaya,* also discussed by Siegel, but unlike Siegel takes the references literally, suggesting that the allusions to illicit sexuality among monks may be to Tantric rites. I find this latter reading unlikely.

7. *RP* 29.15–16.

8. Thanks to the work of Gregory Schopen, we now have a much better understanding of the status of *stūpa*s housing the relics of the Buddha as "legal persons." As evinced in both Buddhist texts and inscriptions, property donated to *stūpa*s, which were, in all cases we know of, in the vicinity of monasteries if not within their precincts, was conceived in monastic law to belong to the Buddha, who was an ongoing, living presence at the site. Such property, then, could not be co-opted by the resident monks for their own use. For further discussion and details, see Schopen 1987a, esp. 206–211.

9. *RP* 32.1–2.

10. *RP* 32.5–6.

11. Nattier 1991.

12. Nattier 1991, 103–110.

13. Nattier 1991, 126.

14. I am indebted for this insight to Michael Carrithers' fine piece on the development of the modern Sri Lankan forest movement; see Carrithers 1979, 298.

15. Silber has identified a similar legalistic bent in medieval Christian monasticism among the more radical eremitic orders (1995, esp. 177–179). Like the authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla,* medieval Christian virtuoso ascetics rejected the corporate wealth of worldly monasteries in favor of a more primitive rule, be it the apostolic life of the Gospels, the discipline of the Desert Fathers, or the pristine rule of St. Benedict.

16. Finot 1901, ix.

17. See Schopen 1992, 1994c, and 2001.

18. Schopen 1995a, 478.

19. Schopen 2000a, 91: "A great deal of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* takes for granted that the monks it was meant to govern had and were expected—even required—to have personal property and private wealth." See Schopen 1995a, 496–497, for the translation of a very interesting account from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* of the monk Upananda, who is reported to have died with a vast quantity of gold, provoking the king to make a claim on it.

20. Schopen 1994a.

21. Schopen 1994b, 173. Cf. *RP* 29.5: "They [corrupt monks] keep cows, horses, asses, livestock, male and female slaves. These ignoble ones are continually preoccupied with agriculture and trade."

22. Schopen 1994a, 553.

23. Cf. Schopen 1995a, 477: "Unless we know what landed, institutional monastic Buddhism had become when Mahāyāna sūtras were being written, it is difficult to understand the attacks on 'abuses' associated with sedentary monasticism found most stridently in Mahāyāna texts like the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā;* it is also difficult to understand similar, if less shrill, criticisms in Mahāyāna texts like the *Kāśyapa-parivarta,* or the constant calls in such texts to return to a life in the forest, or why long sections of the *Samādhirāja-sūtra* are given over to extolling ascetic practices, and why the necessity and value of these same practices is a topic of sharp debate in the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā.*"

24. *SN* II.208–210. Jonathan Silk (2003) has recently argued that the role of Kas-

sapa (Skt. Kāśyapa) as upholder of the rigorous *dhuta* practices as well as his status as heir to Śākyamuni's Dharma, the one who will preserve it until the new dispensation of Maitreya, may well be the source of his prominent presence in a number of early Mahāyāna *sūtras*. Kāśyapa's reputation in effect protects Mahāyāna authors against charges of innovation, since he is the guarantor of a conservative monastic lifestyle and the promulgator of the Buddha's teaching into a future age.

25. *Theragāthā,* vv. 920–925, 928–930, 941–942, 944.

26. I read with the text of the commentary: *-patthāni* for *-pattāni.*

27. *Theragāthā,* vv. 952–957, 962–963, 976–977.

28. Werner (1981) has addressed this issue from a doctrinal perspective. He sees the Mahāyāna attitude toward arhats as in reality a critique of a debased, even cheapened, version of enlightenment in the wake of later Mainstream reforms. The bodhisattva path in his view is an attempt to reestablish the original conception of *bodhi* held by the first generations of the Buddha's disciples, who were thought to have attained an enlightenment in every way equivalent to that of the Buddha's. Although there is very little in the *Rāṣṭrapāla* that would conflict with Werner's intriguing thesis, there are numerous other Mahāyāna *sūtra*s for which this would be far more problematic. Ray has made a similar argument (1994, 203–204), seeing the Mahāyāna critiques as aimed at sedentary monks who claimed, falsely they assumed, arhat status. For Ray, the Mainstream forest saint is not the target of such assaults. The *Rāṣṭrapāla* and many other Mahāyāna *sūtra*s would not support this thesis. The central issue for Mahāyāna texts that address the forest option is usually not location but motivation. Corruption is by no means limited to the settled monasteries, and forest monks who pursued the intensified life with less than worthy intentions are often the subject of severe vituperation.

29. *RP* 28.7-10.

30. In Chapter 6 I will consider further the evolution of this text in light of the full range of our available data.

31. *RP* 28.5–6.

32. *RP* 28.15–16.

33. *RR* VII.25 (trans. in Silk 1994, 382–383).

34. *Sutta-nipāta (Uragavagga),* v. 60. Cf. *RP* 13.4–7: "Having renounced the household, an endless thicket of sin, [bodhisattvas] are always indifferent to wealth. Virtuous, tranquil in spiritual faculties, and mild-mannered, they take pleasure in the wilderness. They are never intimate with women or with men; they dwell alone like a rhinoceros, stainless and with pure intentions."

35. It should come as no surprise by this point that praise of the solitary forest life in such early *sutta*s has long required a response from the sedentary monastic establishment. Monastic apologetics begin at least by the time of the commentaries and continue to the present; see, for example, Wijayaratna 1990, 110: "This *sutta* [the *Khaggavisāṇa*] advocates the solitary life in an exaggerated way; but some scholars have taken it as a standard and have therefore thought that Buddhist monasticism was originally a movement of anchorites. If one takes it as representative of the Buddha's intention, however, difficulties arise: the communal life advocated elsewhere by the Buddha is incompatible

with the extreme solitude praised in the *sutta.* How did this praise of extreme solitude find its way into the Canon? According to the commentaries, the *Khaggavisāna-sutta* did not reflect the Buddha's opinion directly, but that of the 'solitary buddhas' *(paccekabuddhā)* who lived many years before the Buddha Gotama appeared."

36. Cf. Walser 2005, 109: "Depending on how the law was administered in a given monastery, it could easily accommodate assimilative strategies so long as Mahāyānists crafted their strategies carefully. Even so, the road to authentication for new texts and doctrines had to run the gauntlet of the old guard, as it were. Yet any text successfully navigating this road could be considered 'word of the Buddha' so long as it remained within the boundaries circumscribed by more veteran texts." When we consider the strategies employed by the authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* as they attempted to accommodate "the old guard" by assimilating classic Buddhist motifs, thereby disguising their role in its production, it is clear from their own reports that the monastic establishment was not convinced. The acceptance or nonacceptance of "new" *sūtra*s was not, I suspect, determined by doctrinal, legal, or literary considerations as much as it was influenced by allegiances that preceded ideology. I'll have more to say on this below.

37. It is all the more striking, then, that in a number of passages attributed to the *Ratnarāśi* in the *Sūtrasamuccaya* (an anthology of texts attributed, probably wrongly, to Nāgārjuna), we find a much more hostile tone toward the Mainstream tradition and a self-conscious elevation of the bodhisattva path. That none of these passages can be located in the extant *Ratnarāśi* in any language only highlights the gulf between the two voices. See Silk 1994, 691–703, for a detailed discussion of this problem.

38. *RR* V.22 (trans. in Silk 1994, 357–358 with modifications).

39. The one exception to this general pattern is the tenth-century translation of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* by Dānapāla. There are a number of places in Dānapāla's translation where a contrast is highlighted between the great and small vehicles, but these passages are unique to his translation and have all the appearance of interpolations by the translation team.

40. Gregory Schopen has recently shown that a very similar situation holds for another text within the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection, the *Maitreyasiṃhanāda:* "The adherence to one or another 'vehicle' is not an issue for our author anywhere in these polemics. He is taking issue with the behavior of "some" monks regardless of their affiliation. He is not trying to define a mahāyāna over against something else" (1999, 284). Despite my considerable sympathy with Schopen's point here, I am less convinced by his attempts to link the polemic of the *Maitreyasiṃhanāda* to the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* specifically.

41. *RP* 52.11–12: "Having heard about the endless virtues of your voice, which is true, sincere, and inexhaustible—purified by creative stratagems and prudent methods—hundreds of billions of sentient beings, Victor, achieve tranquility (i.e., *nirvāṇa*) by means of the three vehicles."

42. *UP* 20C (trans. in Nattier 2003, 273–275).

43. *UP* 3D (trans. in Nattier 2003, 218–219). See also Nattier 2003, 84–89, for some particularly illuminating remarks on the relationship between the vehicles as reflected in the *UP.* The *UP* is not alone in assuming that those working toward complete buddhahood will precipitate the appearance of *śrāvaka*s and *pratyekabuddha*s; cf. *KP*

§46: "So too, Kāśyapa, where there is the coming into existence of a bodhisattva, there is also the coming into existence of hundreds of thousands of *śrāvaka*s and *pratyeka-buddha*s." See also *KP* §92.

44. Tambiah 1984, 96–101.

45. Tambiah 1984, 85–86.

46. See Kamala 1997, 30–34 and 271–273.

47. Spiro [1970] 1982, 62–63.

48. Carrithers 1983, 271.

49. Stark 1996, 174.

50. I am indebted to Spiro [1970] 1982, 271 for this analogy. It should be pointed out, however, that wealth per se is not generally viewed in Buddhist sources as inherently corrupting. It is what makes possible the exchange of material and symbolic commodities between monks and laymen. Wealth is only a problem when it is used in a way that effaces the distinction between monk and lay. See Kemper 1990 for a similar observation with regard to the role of wealth in Sinhalese Buddhist monasticism.

51. Not surprisingly, Buddhist authors often sought to address this anxiety among lay patrons by tying the benefits that result from their giving to their own intentions, rather than to the moral worthiness of the recipient. In the *Dakkhiṇāvibhaṅga-sutta* of the *MN,* for example, one finds a discussion of the benefits that accrue to one who has made gifts to a variety of worthy persons. The issue of gifts to unworthy persons then must also be dealt with: "There will be, Ānanda, at a future time, destroyers of the lineage with ochre necks, who are immoral and of evil character. [People] will give gifts to these immoral [monks] on behalf of the *saṅgha.* Even then, Ānanda, I say that a gift directed toward the *saṅgha* is incalculable and immeasurable [in merit]" (*MN* III, 256.6–10). For further discussion of the term "ochre necks" *(kāsāvakaṇṭha),* see Chapter 1 of the translation, n. 234, where this passage is also cited. On the complexities and ambiguities of Buddhist conceptions of *dāna* more broadly, see Ohnuma 2005.

52. A representative survey would include, but certainly not be limited to, the following: Johnson 1963; B. Wilson 1967 and 1982; Stark and Bainbridge 1985 and [1987] 1996, esp. 121–153; Stark 1996; Bainbridge 1997, 31–59; Young 1997; and Stark and Finke 2000. For an illuminating comparison of Stark and Bainbridge with Durkheim and Weber, see R. Collins 1997. All of these theoretical models are inadequate for monastic traditions generally (as Collins points out) and for Buddhism specifically. A thoughtful Weberian approach that compares monasticism in medieval Christianity and Theravāda Buddhism can be found in Silber 1995. My analysis below is designed to augment the discussion vis-à-vis the Mahāyāna.

53. Stark and Bainbridge [1979] 1985, 25.

54. For the use of the concept of tension with the socioreligious environment to distinguish sects from churches, see Stark and Bainbridge 1985, 48–67.

55. Stark and Bainbridge [1987] 1996, 124 (emphasis mine).

56. It should go without saying that nothing pejorative is implied in the use of the term "cult" here, despite its reputation in the current vernacular. I again follow Stark and Bainbridge in understanding cults as "social enterprises primarily engaged in the

generation and exchange of novel compensators" ([1987] 1996, 157). When conceived in those terms, it is less difficult to see a text like the *Sukhāvatīvyūha* as proceeding from a cultic context. Its attempt to offer novel compensators, for example, rebirth in the buddha-field of Amitābha through the mere hearing of his name, clearly positioned it well outside mainstream Buddhist circles, including, perhaps, some Mahāyāna groups.

57. Although still not adequately appreciated in our current scholarship, La Vallée Poussin, in his typically prescient manner, pointed out quite some time ago that renunciant bodhisattvas must have been ordained within Mainstream orders. There simply were no other options. See especially La Vallée Poussin 1930. That Heinz Bechert has repeatedly reiterated this fact has not eliminated continued misunderstanding on this matter (see, among other places, Bechert 1973). More recently, Gregory Schopen has referred to this presumption as "only an attractive hypothesis for which there is still no direct or hard evidence" (2005, 115). While there may be no epigraphical evidence of this claim—which Schopen apparently requires—there is a rather telling statement by the Chinese pilgrim Faxian, an eyewitness to matters in India in the early fifth century. He states that he was able to acquire a copy of the *Mahāsāṃghika-vinaya* from what he describes as a Mahāyāna monastery near Pāṭaliputra (see my translation of this passage in Boucher 2000b, 66, and also more conveniently in Li 2002, 202). Whether this evidence is "hard" remains to be seen, but it is certainly "direct." An overview of this problem is now available in Silk 2002.

58. Part of the problem for some bodhisattva fraternities vis-à-vis their monastic communities may have simply been a matter of size. Sociologists of religion have often noted that "growth tends to result in the lowering of a religious group's tension with society and thereby leads to a decline in the average level of member commitment" (Stark and Finke 2000, 154). If Buddhist monasteries had indeed grown large, as some of the archeological evidence and Chinese pilgrim reports suggest, then it is not surprising that some bodhisattva sodalities may have opted for smaller congregations capable of sustaining optimal intensity of commitment among its members.

59. I have repeatedly objected to the use of the term "sect" to refer to *nikāya,* monastic ordination lineages (Boucher 2000b, 63–70; 2002, 258–259; 2005, 293–294), a usage that Jonathan Silk has recently resuscitated (2002, 363–364). This usage breeds confusion, in my opinion, because it conflates a distinction based on disciplinary regulation *within* the mainstream tradition with the more typical sociological designation of a deviant religious group. In fact, I suspect that the confusion between these organizational differences is the source of some of the misunderstandings about the relationship between Mainstream and Mahāyāna groups in the scholarly literature. It is clear to me, however, that Silk himself understands this distinction.

60. The only possible exception to these two poles that I can conceive of is the figures of the *upāsaka* and *upāsikā.* Although these terms are generally translated rather flatly as layman and laywoman, they almost certainly carried far greater significance than has generally been recognized. These are individuals who were very probably semiordained, that is, who had undertaken special vows of discipline and assumed close ties with monastics while remaining officially nonrenunciant. For this reason I tend to translate these offices as "lay brother" and "lay sister," since I suspect they functioned much more like religious

lay orders in Catholicism. La Vallée Poussin (1925) has provided what is almost certainly the best discussion of the status and role of *upāsakas/upāsikās* in Buddhist scholarship. See also the remarks on this issue in Durt 1991 and Schopen 1994c, 75, n. 30. A closer study of their place in Buddhist literature and epigraphy is much needed. I find Jeffrey Samuels' (1999) recent attempt to problematize the lay/monk distinction unconvincing. What he has problematized are the qualities and proclivities often associated with each, not the vocational distinction per se. Moreover, he has failed to distinguish the roles of *upāsakas/upāsikās* from common donors and others of lesser commitment.

61. I should emphasize here, however, that the presence of a lay interlocutor within a text is not necessarily an indication that its authors were addressing a lay audience. There are many possibilities regarding what role such a figure may have played in the rhetorical strategy of any given author, including criticism of his monastic confrères. Mahāyāna studies is still very much in need of a more nuanced understanding of persona, tone, and voice in this literature.

62. Bunnag 1973, 55–56.

63. See Schopen 1992, 1995a, and 2000a.

64. *RP* 14.3.

65. *KP* §124. For other statements of monastic hypocrisy, cf. also *RR* II.20–23 and *RP* 34.5–6: "These ignoramuses [i.e., false bodhisattvas] assert themselves as wise, saying: 'how will others discern me to be learned in the excellent Dharma?' "

66. In this regard it is worth noting Randall Collins' Durkheimian qualification of the generalized compensator theory: "Here we see again religion provides real goods, not only compensators; it provides the emotional/ritual technology for moral legitimation and social impressiveness" (R. Collins 1997, 169).

67. Tib. reads *vastuṃ* as *gos* (= *vastraṃ*), "clothes."

68. *RP* 35.17.

69. *RP* 35.7–8.

70. On the free-rider problem in the sociological literature, see Iannacconne 1994, esp. 1186–1189, and Stark and Finke 2000, 146–150.

71. I am reminded here of the remarks of Ivan Strenski, who argued—rightly, I think—that the process of the domestication of the *saṅgha* was not, contra Weber and Weberians, a degeneration from a purer, peripatetic life, but was instead a natural outgrowth of the system of nonreciprocal, generalized exchange between the laity and the monastic establishment, be they sedentary or forest dwelling (Strenski 1983).

72. See Schopen 1985, 1995b, and 1996.

73. See Shizutani 1962; Schopen 1979 and 1987b.

74. Schopen 2000b has made a similar argument to that offered here, one with which I am in general agreement. His attempt, however, to undermine the value of Chinese sources for our understanding of Indian Buddhism is unfortunately disingenuous. For example, he compares the seeming popularity of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* in third-century China, where we have records of its circulation in limited gentry circles, with its apparent lack of influence in contemporary India. This can only be a comparison of apples and oranges. The types of Chinese materials available make pos-

sible scholarly inquiries that simply cannot be attempted by an Indologist. Given the lack of parallel Indian data, we can only regard this type of comparison as an argument from silence. This said, Schopen has leveled a number of caveats to the use of these sources that are well worth heeding.

Part II. Indian Buddhism through a Chinese Lens

Chapter 5: The Role of Translation in Reconstructing the Early Mahāyāna

1. There has been considerable debate among Indologists on the precise nature of the relationship between the various Buddhist Middle Indo-Āryan languages in which Buddhist texts are preserved or hypothesized to have been redacted. K. R. Norman, for example, has argued: "It cannot be emphasized too much that all the versions of canonical Hīnayāna Buddhist texts which we possess are translations, and even the earliest we possess are translations of some still earlier version, now lost" (1990a, 34); see also Norman 1993, esp. 95-98. Heinz Bechert, in contrast, has suggested that translation—a linguistic transfer between mutually unintelligible languages—is too strong a characterization of this process: "Some scholars believed that this transformation was a real 'translation' of texts which at that time already existed as written literary texts. Others think—and I agree with them—that the transposition was no formalized translation. It was another kind of transformation from one dialect into another dialect, that took place in the course of a tradition, which was still an oral tradition, but had already entered the process of being formalized linguistically" (1980, 12). Even if, as Bechert and others propose, the transfer involved a mechanical transposition between the sound systems of two related dialects, it is also clear that this process led to a number of mistaken interpretations, suggesting that this movement was not always straightforward, even to learned scribes.

2. This has been suggested also in Schopen 2000b, 25.

3. For a list of the geographic distribution of the *nikāya*s, see Lamotte [1958] 1988, 523-528, and Dutt [1970] 1977, esp. 281-312 on the reports by Chinese pilgrims.

4. The exception is the inscribed Amitābha statue from Mathurā dated during the reign of the Kushan king Huviṣka, which would place it in the second century C.E. On this to date unique record, see Schopen 1987b. Schopen concludes: "What is a little more surprising is the fact that—epigraphically—the 'beginning' of the Mahāyāna in India is not documentable until the 2nd century A.D., and that even as 'late' as that it was still an extremely limited minority movement that left almost no mark on Buddhist epigraphy or art and was still clearly embedded in the old established purposes of earlier Buddhist groups. What is even more surprising still is the additional fact that even after its initial appearance in the public domain in the 2nd century it appears to have remained an extremely limited minority movement—if it remained at all—that attracted absolutely no *documented* public or popular support for at least two more centuries" (124).

5. Perhaps the most cogent discussion of the problems besetting the quest for the

origins of the cluster of movements we refer to as the Mahāyāna is the article by Paul Harrison (1995).

6. I use the term alpha-syllabic to refer to Indian scripts (viz., *brāhmī* and *kharoṣṭhī*) since they are neither alphabets consisting of letters for each phoneme nor syllabaries in which each symbol represents one and only one syllable (consonant + vowel). Unlike syllabaries such as Japanese *kana,* Indian scripts are modified to represent changes of vowel quality with each consonant symbol.

7. This is, of course, a gross simplification. There is in fact some evidence in Old Chinese of morphological change that is not yet fully understood. The problem is that the Chinese writing system has concealed much of the complexity of the early language. One of the most thorough treatments of these issues can be found in Boltz 1994, esp. 90–126 on the multivalence of Chinese graphs and 168–177 on the trend toward graphic desemanticization in some pre-Han texts, a trend that, if it had continued, would have allowed the Chinese script to function more like a syllabary.

8. Exceptions to this general rule would probably include those émigrés whose families had long been settled in China, such as Zhi Qian and Dharmarakṣa, and perhaps a few Chinese such as Zhu Fonian, who lived in border regions (e.g., Liangzhou) and had frequent interaction with foreign monks. I will discuss the evidence for Dharmarakṣa's skill in both Indian and Chinese languages in more detail below.

9. Ch'en 1960, 178. Cf. van Gulik 1956, 13: "The frequent statements met with in Chinese Buddhist literature to the effect that a Chinese monk was 'thoroughly conversant with the Sanskrit language' must in most cases be taken *cum grano salis.* It must be remembered that the authors of monks' biographies and similar literary works were devout Buddhists and thus liable to exaggerate the virtue and knowledge of the venerated persons they were writing about. Further . . . the average Chinese scholar considered a knowledge of the Indian script alone tantamount to a knowledge of the Sanskrit language. Chinese terms like *fan-hsüeh-seng* 'a monk who has studied Sanskrit' as a rule means nothing more than 'a monk who has mastered the Indian script.' "

10. Zürcher 1977 and 1991; also Matsuo 1988 and Karashima 1996.

11. Cf. Zürcher 1995, 70: "This one-sided emphasis upon literary activity of course seriously distorts the picture. During the early medieval period there must have been great numbers of foreign monks in China, especially in the largest cities. In contemporary texts, both Buddhist and secular, we find tantalizingly vague references to 'foreign monks' (*huseng* 胡僧) or 'Indian monks' (*fanseng* 梵僧) in various roles that have nothing to do with translation; they are just said to be living in a large monastery patronized by the court, or they visit a convent where they are given a vegetarian meal, or they figure as a kind of exotic wandering magicians."

12. On the cult practice of Emperor Huan in the mid-second century, see Seidel 1969, 48–49, and Sharf 1996; on Ze Rong's ritual activity, see Zürcher [1959] 1972, 27–28, and Tsukamoto/Hurvitz 1985, 72–75.

13. For more details on the life and translation career of Dharmarakṣa, see Boucher 1996, esp. 11–102, and 2006.

14. Cf. Schopen 2000b, 2: "Chinese translations have also been used—less success-

fully I think—to try to track what have been seen as developments within a given Indian text. The nature and number of assumptions and methodological problems involved in such a use have not, however, always or ever been fully faced, and it is not impossible that some—if not a great deal—of what has been said on the basis of Chinese translations about the history of an Indian text has more to do with the history of Chinese translation techniques and Chinese religious or cultural predilections than with the history of the Indian text itself." My analysis of Dharmarakṣa's translation later in this chapter and in Chapter 6 will be very much concerned with the Chinese translation techniques and will show, I think, that the situation is not as dire as Schopen suspects.

15. In this regard see, for example, Snell-Hornby 1988, which attempts to integrate reflections on translation theory into the pragmatic concerns of translation practice.

16. Robinson 1967, 157.

17. Perhaps the most famous of the twentieth-century critics of translation are Walter Benjamin and Vladimir Nabokov. So concerned were they with maintaining the semantic shape and literary sensibility of an original work that Benjamin accepted only interlinear glosses as "real" translation, and Nabokov vehemently opposed all but the most literal—some might say slavish—renderings. A brief presentation of their views can be found in Schulte and Biguenet 1992, 71–82 and 127–143 respectively.

18. For example, an impressive examination of the process of translating Kālidāsa's *Śākuntala* into European languages can be found in Figueira 1991.

19. See Zürcher [1959] 1972, 31, for a succinct summary of the basic process. For other scholarly discussions of the translation process in China, see Fuchs 1930; Hrdličková 1958; Ch'en 1960; Tso 1963; Held 1972, 67–92; Char 1991; Zacchetti 1996; and Boucher 1996, esp. 62–102 (with emphasis on Dharmarakṣa's translation committees). By the Tang and Song periods, the translation bureaus became quite complex; see most recently Sen 2002, esp. 31–43.

20. We have only a brief record within Sengyou's list of Dharmarakṣa's translations noting the title and translation date of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* (*CSZJJ*, 55: 7c). The date for the completion of the translation is recorded as the sixth year of the Taishi reign period, in the ninth month and on the thirtieth day (= October 31, 270).

21. The colophon reads *taishi* 太始 here for *taishi* 泰始, a reign period encompassing the years 265–274 C.E.

22. Tokiwa assumes that this record is mistaken, having confused some monastery in Chang'an with the famous Baima si of Luoyang (1938, 611). I have difficulty, however, in finding anything approaching an explanation in his remarks. I see no reason why a monastery in Chang'an could not have been named after the famous translation center of Han Buddhism, especially if it too served as a regular site for Dharmarakṣa's translation work. On the existence of a Baima si in Chang'an and perhaps even its priority to the famous center at Luoyang of the same name, see Palumbo 2003, 186–199.

23. On the naming and location of this gate, note Yan Shigu's (581–645) commentary on *Hanshu*, j. 99B, p. 4144: 師古曰：三輔黃圖云 長安城東出南頭名霸城門 俗以其色青 名曰青門 (The *Sanfu huangtu* [a medieval work, no longer extant, which contained records of the old ruins of Chang'an] states: "Going out of the eastern side of the city wall of

Chang'an, the southern entrance is called Bacheng Gate; popularly regarded as blue in color, it is called 'the Azure Gate.' "). I am indebted to Palumbo 2003, 187–191, for this reference. Palumbo has noted some problems with regard to this mention of a Baima si *inside* the Azure Gate of Chang'an, based in part on other sixth-eighth-century Buddhist sources. While his lining up of the records is impressive, I remain unconvinced that the precise placement of this monastery can be decisively determined by these much later sources, which are not themselves consistent with each other. However, I should also note that Dharmarakṣa's biography in both the *CSZJJ* (55: 98a.8–9) and *Gaoseng zhuan* (50: 326c.23) report that he established a monastery *outside* the Azure Gate of Chang'an. This must be a reference to the same Baima si as in this colophon. See Palumbo 2003, 194–195, on this testimony and Boucher 2006, 14–21, for a translation of Dharmarakṣa's biography.

24. This is the only colophon to my knowledge that identifies Dharmarakṣa as an Indian. The *Gaoseng zhuan* also identifies him with the same ethnikon and transcription of his name (50: 326c.2). We might expect that his ethnikon *zhu* 竺, adopted from that of his teacher, could have led to such a confusion. Palumbo takes the statement of Dharmarakṣa's Indian nationality as indicating the potential inauthenticity of this record (2003, 188), without considering the likelihood that it was adopted by Dharmarakṣa from the ethnikon of his teacher, a common practice among Chinese Buddhists in this period.

25. The text reads here *shou shou* 手受, which could be a mistake for *bishou* 筆受, the standard expression to designate those who wrote down the oral translation. I have left the text unemended, assuming that the two expressions are essentially synonomous.

26. In a separate notice to Sengyou's list of Dharmarakṣa's translation corpus (*CSZJJ*, 55: 9c.9–11), An Wenhui and Bo Yuanxin are described as "receiving [the text] with the brush" (*bishou* 筆受), not as those "who transfer the words"; no mention is made of the three scribes of this colophon. Given the apparent incompleteness of this separate notice in comparison to the colophon translated here, it seems preferable to accept the reading of the colophon.

27. This date is problematic, as has been pointed out by Palumbo (2003, 188), since the twelfth month of Taishi 2 has only twenty-nine days. If thirty is a mistake for thirteen, then the date would be equivalent to January 25, 267. Zhisheng, in his *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* (T 2154, 494c), does in fact place the completion of this translation on the thirteenth day, but in the year Taishi 3. Obviously this constitutes an emendation for which we have no clear justification (cf. Palumbo 2003, 190–191, n. 66). It is possible, as I suggest below, that the colophon composers may not always have been fully current with calendrical changes as they recorded the dates of these works. Nevertheless, there is no clear solution to the date of the completion of this translation other than that it must have been finished in late January or early February of 267.

28. *CSZJJ*, 55: 48b.22–26.

29. Waley 1957, 196.

30. Link 1960, 30.

31. Robinson 1967, 298, n. 28.

32. Shih 1968, 168.

33. Stephen Bokenkamp has suggested that this use of *chu* may be parallelled in Dao-

ist contexts (personal communication, November 2003), particularly in the expression *chu shi* 出世, "[scriptures] appear in the world," in effect, are brought forth as new revelations.

34. The Kuchean layman Bo Yuanxin would continue to be an active participant on Dharmarakṣa's translation committees. He is named, for instance, as one of the collators of the finished translation of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra;* see the translation of this colophon below.

35. The fact that the Chinese translations are nearly always attributed to one, usually foreign, translator and not to members of his committee has more to do with concerns for legitimation and orthodoxy in China than with historical accuracy. Antonino Forte has astutely observed: "The assignment of the responsibility for a translation was an extremely important matter as its purpose was to reassure the Buddhist establishment and the government of the full authenticity and orthodoxy of a work. This need to make one person responsible often meant that the actual contribution of other members of the team tended to be unacknowledged. The paradox thus often arose of the accredited translator, usually a foreigner, being unable to speak or write Chinese, while the actual translators received so little attention that, but for the colophons at the end of a number of translations, we would often not have even known their names" (1984, 316).

36. For examples of both kinds of scribal intrusions, including some from the *Suvikrāntacintidevaputra-paripṛcchā-sūtra,* see Boucher 1998, esp. 489 and 497–498.

37. It has been shown that the early Chinese use of the designation Jibin 罽賓 referred to a region that incorporated much of Gandhāra and adjacent areas of northwest India and not just Kashmir; see Kuwayama 1987, 708–712, and his revised discussion in Kuwayama 2006, 107–113, and also F. Enomoto 1994.

38. The division of these names is very tentative. In his translation of this colophon, Demiéville left them untranscribed, in his own words, "ne sachant comment les couper" (1954, 348, n. 5). I too am at a loss for the proper division of these names; the last two prefixed with the ethnikon *zhi* 支 (for Yuezhi) are alone certain. I have for the others followed the suggestion of Tsukamoto/Hurvitz 1985, 552, n. 4. For an alternative division of these names, see Tang [1938] 1983, 111. Zürcher remarks that only one of the donors named in this colophon is clearly Chinese ([1959] 1972, 68), thus illustrating the extent to which Buddhism remained a basically foreign religion even in the late third century. But by the division of the names proposed by Tsukamoto, we would count five of the seven as Chinese, there being no specifically identifying ethnikon to suggest otherwise. By Tang Yongtong's estimate, four of six are Chinese. Though Zürcher's point is not without merit, it would probably be unwise to diminish the contributions of native Chinese to these translations even at Dunhuang.

39. *Zhengshu* 正書, "regular or standard script" (also know as *kaishu* 楷書); this is a calligraphic style that begins in the early Northern and Southern Dynasties period and reaches its apex in the Tang. For an early example of a manuscript in standard script found at Dunhuang from among Dharmarakṣa's translations, see the *Buddhasaṃgīti-sūtra* discussed in Kanda 1962, especially 242–247, and Chen 1983.

40. The text, in fact, has thirty chapters. As Demiéville points out, either a twenty-seven chapter version of this text circulated widely in China—down through the Yuan

period judging from the catalogues—or bibliographers merely repeated earlier statements without ever looking at the text itself (1954, 349, n. 1). Nevertheless, it is worth pointing out that the final three chapters are Mahāyānic in orientation and thus quite out of character with the rest of the text. We have no reason, however, to doubt the authenticity of Dharmarakṣa's translation of them.

41. T 606, 15: 230, n. 19. For other renderings of this colophon and a discussion of issues related to it, see Demiéville 1954, 348–349, and Tsukamoto/Hurvitz 1985, 552, n. 4.

42. For a more detailed discussion of Dharmarakṣa's biography in the context of his translation career, see Boucher 2006.

43. We know, for example, that it was possible for explanatory notes to become mixed together with a translated text. These notes could be those of the translator himself or of those who reedited the text shortly after its translation, or perhaps even a combination of both, as may be the case with An Shigao's *Anban shouyi jing* (T 602). On the intralinear notes to this translation, see Deleanu 1992, especially 52–55. There is exciting new work being done on An Shigao's *Anban shouyi jing* in light of a recently discovered manuscript version from Kongō Temple in Osaka, Japan; see Deleanu 2003 and the bibliography therein. Another example is the first fascicle of Zhi Qian's *Da mingdu jing* (T 225) *[Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā-sūtra];* see Lai 1983. Since we have no Sanskrit original or Tibetan translation of the *Yogācārabhūmi-sūtra* for comparison, far-reaching speculation on the nature of its translation idiom would be out of place. For a masterful analysis of Dharmarakṣa's translation compared with An Shigao's second-century rendition (consisting only of chapters 1–5, 22, and 24 of Dharmarakṣa's version), see Demiéville 1954, especially 397–434.

44. While nothing in the later colophons contradicts this general statement, it is nevertheless noteworthy that the translation process of texts rendered very close in time with each other could be described with quite different verbs. But the differences here may have to do with the objects of these verbs and less with the activity designated. The *brāhmī* manuscript of the *Mañjuśrīvikurvaṇaparivarta-sūtra,* rendered in 289, is described as "orally delivered" (*kouxuan* 口宣) into Chinese. In 291 the *Śūraṃgamasamādhi-sūtra* is said to have been "orally rendered" (*kouchu* 口出). Also in 291 the *Tathāgatamahākaruṇānirdeśa-sūtra* is said to have been "orally conferred" (*koushou* 口授) upon Nie Chengyuan and Nie Daozhen. We would not expect that Dharmarakṣa carried out fundamentally different tasks in each of these cases.

45. Boucher 1998, 485–489.

46. In Boucher 2000a I argue that the term *hu* in these colophons is very likely to indicate a *kharoṣṭhī* script source text. I have translated accordingly.

47. *kouxuan* (Yuan and Ming editions add *chuan*) *chu* 口 宣(傳) 出.

48. The question is, the first year of which reign period? Tsukamoto/Hurvitz assume the reign period to be Yongkang [= 291] (1985, 551, n. 3), but that is unlikely given that that reign period only begins in the third month. The first new year after the Taikang period is Taixi, which would make this date equivalent to March 3, 290. This problem is exacerbated by the fact that there are four rapidly succeeding changes of reign titles in the years 290/291; whether the anonymous colophon writer was in touch with

such changes at court is impossible to determine. Tang ([1938] 1983, 112) and Okabe (1983, 21) read *yuan nian* 元年 here as a mistake for [Taikong] *jiu nian* 九年 [= March 25, 288]. This reading has the advantage of explaining why a new reign title was not specifically mentioned in the notice.

49. Exactly what the Chang'an devotee Sun Bohu did is not entirely clear. The colophon states that he *xie sujie* 寫素解, "copied [the translation, making] a simple exegesis." Okabe proposes to read *xie sujuan* 寫素絹, "copied it onto pure silk" (1983, 21). Though perhaps a clearer reading, there is no obvious reason to adopt such an emendation. Interestingly, Sun Bohu is mentioned in Dharmarakṣa's biography in the *Gaoseng zhuan* (T 2059, 50: 327a.6–7) as one of the several people who regularly "held the brush and collated [the translation] in detail at the request of Dharmarakṣa." It is not unreasonable to hypothesize that if Sun Bohu did in fact play a significant role on Dharmarakṣa's translation committees as the *GSZ* suggests, then he very well may have produced a series of exegetical notes to the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra* for the faithful in Chang'an as he copied down the text, perhaps even at the request of Dharmarakṣa himself.

50. Among the Chinese on this translation committee are three members of the Zhang 張 clan: two scribes and one of the patrons. Wolfram Eberhard has listed this clan name among the prominent families at Dunhuang from early times (1956, esp. 213–214), and members of this clan are known to have been particularly active in the production of Buddhist texts at Dunhuang in later periods (see Teiser 1994, 146, n. 26).

51. Nie Chengyuan was by all accounts Dharmarakṣa's closest disciple. He is mentioned in a number of colophons to Dharmarakṣa's translations, including the earliest, the *Suvikrāntacintidevaputra-paripṛcchā,* translated in 267 C.E. Thus he had over twenty years of experience working on Dharmarakṣa's translation teams by the time of this rendering of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka.* Furthermore, he is eulogized in Dharmarakṣa's biography as follows: "[Nie] Chengyuan was wise and experienced, talented and principled—devout in the work of the Dharma. When Master Hu [Dharmarakṣa] rendered scriptures, he [Nie Chengyuan] would frequently examine and revise them" (*CSZJJ,* 55: 98a.26–27). Suzuki has discussed the possible influence of Nie Chengyuan's scribal duties on translation vocabulary choices in Dharmarakṣa's corpus (1995, 724), and I have speculated on his role in the production of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* translation specifically (Boucher 1998, esp. 496–498).

52. See, for example, the colophon to his *Lalitavistara,* translated in 308 C.E. (*CSZJJ,* 55: 48b.27–c.1).

53. Cf. Zürcher 1995, 84–85: "Most of them [foreign missionaries] just 'produced' (*chu* 出) the Indian text by oral recitation. After a prolonged stay in China some were able to take part in the actual work of translation, and only very few of them could explain texts and hold sermons in Chinese. In other words, they generally played a rather passive role, as repositories of memorized texts and as reciters. And this has had of course grave consequences; in most cases the work of interpretation largely was a Chinese affair—and this in turn explains much of what is characteristic in Chinese Buddhism."

54. See Boucher 1998 for numerous examples of infelicities in this translation, some of which most likely occurred from a mishearing of Dharmarakṣa's oral recitation

on the part of his assistants, and others, from Chinese philosophical and religious intrusions into the text.

55. The loss of this distinction between aspirated and unaspirated consonants, especially common in the cases of g/gh and d/dh, may have been due to the influence of Iranian speakers neighboring Gāndhārī-using regions; see Konow 1929, ci–cii, and Brough 1962, 100–101. We have no way to determine, however, the degree to which nonnative readers of Gāndhārī texts would have been aware of these orthographic habits.

56. See Brough 1962, vv. 10, 70, 106, 107, 163, and 181; for the form *sagara* = *saṃskāra,* see v. 303.

57. Cf. 4: 413a.3: 種種具足審寂寞 corresponding to *RP* 16.13: *vicarati saṃskṛta sarva māyabhūtam* (he considers all conditioned things as like illusions).

58. See Boucher 1998, 480.

59. Cf. the Khotan *Dharmapāda* (Brough 1962), vv. 18, 80, 109, 163, 198, and 199.

60. On these latter functions, see Bokenkamp 1997, 299–300 and 313.

61. Examples include the following: 4: 412c.4–5: 習閑居野處 (habituated to quiet living in the wilderness) = *RP* 13.17: *araṇyavāsānutsarjanatā* (not abandoning residence in the wilderness); 412c.14: 樂在閑居 (takes pleasure in quiet living) = *RP* 15.10–11: *araṇyavāsaḥ* (dwelling in the wilderness); 412c.22: 閑居寂寞無所起 (dwelling quietly, tranquil and alone, without origination [?]) = *RP* 16.3: *araṇyavividhaprānta sevamāno* (frequenting the wilderness and manifold hinterlands); 413c.19: 在閑居 (dwells in a quiet place) = *RP* 35.17: *'raṇyam upeti* (he enters the wilderness); and so forth.

62. On the literary figures of the Seven Sages of the Bamboo grove generally, see Holzman 1956; for the essays of Xi Kang, see Hendricks 1983; on Ruan Ji, see Holzman 1976, esp. 110–136, for poems challenging conventional values in favor of a life of carefree wandering. On the theme of reclusion in early medieval Chinese literature, see Berkowitz 2000.

Chapter 6: Mistranslation and Missed Translation

1. Boucher 1998, esp. 471–475. Some preliminary data connecting the northwestern Prakrit with Chinese transcriptions of Buddhist names and terms can be found in Waldschmidt 1932, 226–249. Harold Bailey (1946) delineated more precisely the nature of this Indic language and noted some possible evidence for it in Chinese sources. It is, however, in Brough 1962 and 1965 that the so-called Gāndhārī hypothesis takes actual shape. It has since been repeated widely, including in Bernhard 1970, von Hinüber 1982 and 1983, Pulleyblank 1983, Nishimura 1987, and Salomon 1999 (though more recently Salomon has qualified his support for this thesis; see Salomon 2006, 144).

2. For the broad contours of "Greater Gandhāra" and the problems posed by the extant materials related to this region, see Salomon 1999, 3–13.

3. On the term *pratibhāna* in Mahāyāna *sūtra* literature, see MacQueen 1981 and 1982.

4. The Tibetan reads *gzuṅs daṅ spobs pa tshol bar byed pa na* (seeking the acquisi-

tion of *dhāraṇīs* and eloquence), and Jñānagupta reads 求陀羅尼及辯才 (seeking *dhāraṇīs* and eloquence).

5. For the Wardak Vase inscription, see Konow 1929, 165–170 and esp. plate XXXIII (e.g., line 1, Kamagulyapu[tra] and line 3, *avaṣaḍ(r)igaṇa*). Some of the British Library manuscripts use, albeit only intermittently, the later form of *ka* with a stroke curving from top to lower right, see Salomon 1999, 116–117, and Salomon 2000, 63.

6. This confusion assumes that the *hu-* in Dharmarakṣa's manuscript had been damaged or that the vowel *mātra* and right arm at the base of the *akṣara* were indistinct. There may be an analogue for this in the recently edited Gāndhārī **Khargaviṣaṇa-sūtra,* in which one instance of a *ha akṣara* closely approximates the form of the unmarked vowel *a;* see Salomon 2000, 70.

7. Here the Tibetan reads *mdog ṅan pa* (= *durvarṇam*), confirming Dharmarakṣa's *zai chou e zhong* 在醜惡中, "into an ugly condition." Jñānagupta's *e se* 惡色 (of bad appearance) would also seem to support this reading.

8. On the close graphic similarity of these two *akṣara*s in *kharoṣṭhī* records from the first century C.E., see Konow 1929, cxxiii; Rapson and Noble 1929, 308; Fussman 1989, 465; Salomon 1998a, 55; and Salomon 1999, 116–117.

9. For a detailed discussion of one such example from Dharmarakṣa's translation of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra,* see Boucher 1998, 499–500, and Boucher 2000a, 12–14. There are two other examples of possible misapprehensions of *kharoṣṭhī ya/śa* in the *Rāṣṭrapāla,* though both are somewhat more ambiguous. The first occurs at *RP* 14.14–15: *prāntaśayyāsanābhiratiṃ sā ca lābhasatkārānapekṣatayā* (takes pleasure in lodgings [lit. "beds and seats"] in secluded hinterlands on account of his indifference to profit and honor). Dharmarakṣa renders this as follows (4: 412c.9–10): 樂受教命其心不著財利 (happy to receive decrees, his thoughts are not attached to wealth or benefits). Obviously something is seriously amiss here. Dharmarakṣa's *shou* 受 seems to have confused *prānta-* with *prāpta* (< *pratta,* Gdh. *prata*) and his *jiaoming* (teachings, decrees) may have been the result of a mistaken reading *[śa]śāsana* (teaching), which also appears in the Gāndhārī *Dharmapada* as *śaśaṇa* (cf. Brough 1962, vv. 69, 70, 77, 123, and 258). Another, also ambiguous example can be found at *RP* 34.11: *iha śāsane tuṣṭim utpādayiṣyanti* (they will take satisfaction in the teaching at this time [only for profit]). Dharmarakṣa reads (4: 413b.17–18): 其所在處不能得安 (wherever they are, they will not be at ease). If we suppose that Dharmarakṣa misread the initial *śa* of *śāsane* as *ya* (with long vowels typically unmarked in *kharoṣṭhī* script), then it is possible that he understood this clause as *iha yasa* (= *yasya/yasmin*) *na*. . . . Such a supposition—and that is all this can be—also accounts for Dharmarakṣa's unexpected negative marker (*bu* 不), which is not represented in the extant Sanskrit or Tibetan. Neither of these two examples, however, is without problems.

10. For an edition of Niya 510, see Boyer et al. 1927, 184–185; for Niya 511, see Boyer et al. 1927, 185–187; and for Niya 523, see Boyer et al. 1918 and Boyer et al. 1927, 191. There has been considerable attention recently to these texts by Chinese and Japanese scholars: on Niya 510, see Hasuike 1997 and Lin 1998, 142–150; on Niya 511, see Hasuike 1996, Iwamatsu 2001 and 2002, and Lin 2003. Both Iwamatsu and Lin have attempted new translations of Niya 511, and Lin has also identified a connection with the fragmentary

Niya 647. I am less persuaded, however, by his attempt to link this *kharoṣṭhī* document both with the Dharmaguptakas and with a Chinese translation dubiously attributed to An Shigao (T 701, 16: 802c–803c). I have argued elsewhere for the possibility of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit texts transcribed in *kharoṣṭhī* script; see Boucher 1998, esp. 498–503. For examples of *kharoṣṭhī* manuscript fragments from the Pelliot collection written in Sanskrit, see Salomon 1998b. Mark Allon and Richard Salomon have more recently reported on a Gāndhārī Hybrid Sanskrit version of the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* preserved in the Schøyen collection; see Allon and Salomon 2000, and Salomon 2001.

11. This is by no means a consistent pattern; there is considerable variation among the Gāndhārī sources. This assimilation is found, for example, in the Khotan *Dharmapada* with some regularity (cf. Brough 1962, §46) and also in the Niya documents, but with less consistency (cf. Burrow 1937, §46). In both cases unvoiced stops are typically voiced. Likewise among the new British Library *kharoṣṭhī* fragments, the *Rhinoceros Sūtra* tends to retain *anusvāra* more or less correctly in conjunction with consonants (Salomon 2000, §5.9.3) whereas in the *Ekottarikāgama* fragments, *anusvāra* before homorganic stop is never marked, and the stop remains unchanged (see Allon 2001, §5.2.3.1). It is not difficult to fathom how such a range of phonological permutations, which must have been present also in Dharmarakṣa's time, could have greatly impeded his ability to properly interpret texts in *kharoṣṭhī* script with substantial Gāndhārī influence.

12. Dharmarakṣa's committee had difficulty with the nasal + palatal stop combination elsewhere in their translation. In chapter 2, v. 38 (*RP* 43.13), we find the following *pāda: saṃsārapañjaragataṃ jagad īkṣya cedaṃ* (seeing this world stuck in the cage of *saṃsāra*). Dharmarakṣa rendered this as follows: 皆見於五道 生死諸人民 (seeing all the people in *saṃsāra,* amidst the five destinies . . .). If Dharmarakṣa was working with a *kharoṣṭhī* manuscript in which *paja[ra]* (= *pañjara*) was deduced as deriving from *pañca,* then he and/or his collaborators might have interpreted the compound *saṃsāra-pañjaragataṃ* incorrectly as *saṃsāra-pañcagati.* One suspects that such misinterpretations would have resulted from the committee's use of default translations when confronted with ambiguities of Middle Indo-Āryan phonology that they were ill equipped to differentiate.

13. Brough 1962, 170–171 (vv. 325 and 331).

14. A survey of the British Library *kharoṣṭhī* manuscript fragments, the most diverse and extensive to date, can be found in Salomon 1999. For an overview of the Senior manuscripts, see Salomon 2003. Salomon and his students are currently engaged in the decipherment, study, and translation of each of these texts. A preliminary catalogue and survey of the Bajaur collection can be found in Strauch 2007. I have been informed by scholars working on the Schøyen manuscripts that there appear to be small fragments of a Mahāyāna text, the *Bhadrakalpika-sūtra,* within this collection as well (see Glass 2004, 141). If this proves to be the case—and that is still uncertain at the moment—it would be only the second instance of a Mahāyāna text among our finds of Gandhāran literature.

15. Attempts to see Mahāyāna influence in the art historical record of Greater Gandhāra have not been convincing; see most recently Rhi 2006, which offers more speculation than evidence. Nor do I find the recently discovered legends surrounding the Kushan king

Huviṣka's adherence to the Mahāyāna in the Schøyen manuscripts to be compelling evidence in this regard. Note Salomon 2002, 261: "This convergence around Huviṣka of early allusions to Mahāyāna concepts might be a mere coincidence, but the new material seems rather to suggest that the time of Huviṣka was a pivotal one in the development of the Mahāyāna." The fragments that Salomon edited in this piece are entirely legendary in character, much like the many legends surrounding Kaniṣka's role in the late Buddhist councils. The Amitābha inscription from Mathurā dated during the reign of Huviṣka remains our only historically placeable record for this movement on the Indian subcontinent before the fourth or fifth century. In other words, nothing in our extant evidence points toward a "pivotal" change in the development of the Mahāyāna until the Gupta period.

16. Scholars of Buddhism who seek evidence of a Mahāyāna presence in the Northwest often forget that the archeological evidence for Buddhism generally is not as great as often supposed. See Callieri 2006: "If we leave aside the preconception that Taxila is a centre where Buddhist art grew in its initial phase, the archeological evidence shows us a town where the main religion was a local one" (76). He continues: "When we consider the sum of archeological evidence indicating the Buddhist presence in urban settlements of the Northwest, it is striking that there is an almost complete absence of pre-Kuṣāṇa layers and a weak presence during the Kuṣāṇa period" (77).

17. As stated in the Introduction, those parts of the Sanskrit text that are also extant in Dharmarakṣa's translation are marked in my English translation by bold type. Thus the reader can easily discern those portions known and not known to our earliest witness.

18. Cf. de Jong 1977 with regard to the textual history of the *Kāśyapaparivarta:* "The Kāśyapaparivarta, in which the verse parts are later than the prose parts, offers an interesting example of a text in which the verses, written in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, are definitely later than the prose parts, the language of which is much closer to standard Sanskrit" (255).

19. This is not to say, however, that there are no differences between the versions postdating Dharmarakṣa's translation. A number of those differences are noted in the annotation to my translation.

Part III. An Annotated Translation of the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā-sūtra*

One: Prologue

1. Tib. omits reference to *śrāvaka*s and *pratyekabuddha*s. All three Chin. translations omit this formula entirely.

2. MS: *spaṣṭam āviścakāra* (contra Finot's *spaṣṭamāṃ viścakārāṃ*).

3. This eulogy is not included in the Tib. or Chin. translations.

4. There is by now a large, almost unwieldy, scholarship on the punctuation and interpretation of this opening formula. The most prominent remarks include the following: von Stäel-Holstein 1933, iv; Brough 1949–1950; Samtani 1964–1965; von Hinüber

1968, 84–87; Wayman and Wayman 1974, 59, n. 1; Kajiyama 1977; Schopen 1978, 162–164; Okamoto 1985 and 1997; Silk 1989; Harrison 1990, 5, n. 3; Galloway 1991 and 1997; Tatz 1993; Vetter 1993, 65, n. 48. My own rendering for the most part follows Harrison's reasonable statement. Tola and Dragonetti (1999) have objected to this lack of punctuation in the opening formula (citing my translation of the *Nagaropama-sūtra;* see Bongard-Levin et al. 1996, 90). But I am at a loss to understand what they mean by the "criterion of usefulness" in deciding between competing divisions of this formula. Indian manuscripts routinely omit punctuation at both junctures; see Schopen 1978, 163, where he notes that in the Gilgit manuscripts, as often in the Nepalese, the first mark of punctuation generally occurs after *viharati sma* (and the Nepalese MS of the *RP* omits punctuation here as well). My rendering here reflects the ambiguity of the phrasing, an ambiguity that may well have been intentional. Commentators ancient and modern have already spilled much ink in addressing this problem; I seriously doubt that it is worth much more.

5. Dh reads five hundred bodhisattvas. There is a large gap in Dh's translation at this point. His translation resumes at Finot 1901, 4.20. For an overview of which parts of the Indic text are represented in Dh's translation as well as a discussion on the implications of such gaps for the textual history of the *RP,* see Chapter 6.

6. Dp adds here: *zhi zhu waidao fa dadaoxin* 制諸外道發大道心 (overcome heretical teachings and set out for the aspiration to enlightenment).

7. Jg reads "buddha gnosis" (*fo zhi* 佛智).

8. Omitted in Dp.

9. Missing from Jg.

10. For *anantapratibhānapratilabdhair asaṅgavaiśāradyapratilabdhair,* Dp reads "[Endowed with] the four realizations free of attachment and thoroughly versed in the four attractive dispositions *[catuḥsaṃgrahavastu?]*" (*si wuai zhi tongda si she* 四無礙智通達四攝).

11. The inclusion of *yāvat* here suggests that the authors assumed this list of attributes continued beyond what is included here; see *BHSD* 447 (2).

12. Skt. *sarvaguṇavarṇaparyādattaiḥ,* but Tib. suggests we read *-gaṇa-* in place of *-varṇa- (yon tan gyi tshogs thams cad zad mi śes pa).* I have followed the Tib. See de Jong 1967, 4.

13. *Śrīgarbha* is a kind of gem; see *BHSD* 535, where other references to *śrīgarbhasiṃhāsana* are noted.

14. Jg renders *durāsadakāyaś* as *weide nan zhan* 威德難瞻 (whose awe-inspiring virtue is difficult to encounter).

15. Cf. below, v. 34 and note.

16. For *anātmaśūnyasarvadharma-* Jg incorporated the more formulaic list: *wuxiang kong wuyuan fa* 無相空無願法 (things are without characteristics *[animitta],* are empty *[śūnya],* and are without aim *[apraṇihita]*). It is possible that Jg's Indic manuscript had such a variant.

17. Tib. reads a little differently: *me'i phuṅ po chen po ltar 'gro ba thams cad la snaṅ ba'i sku daṅ ldan* (he is endowed with a body that shines over the whole world like

a great multitude of fires). It appears that the Tib. translators (or their source text) may have read *avabhāsakāyaḥ* in place of *avabhāsakaraḥ.* Jg agrees with the Tib., while Dp appears to accord with the Skt.

18. *trisāhasramahāsāhasram lokadhātum.* On this translation see La Vallée Poussin [1923–1931] 1980, 2: 170, n. 1, where he indicates that the term "chiliocosme" was coined by Rémusat. In Buddhist cosmology this term denotes a universe that contains a thousand worlds, each of which includes a thousand worlds that in turn include another thousand "small" worlds—all told, one-thousand cubed or one billion worlds.

19. I read with de Jong (1967, 4) *suviniścitārthaḥ* in light of Tib. *don śin tu rnam par ṅes pa.*

20. Dp has understood *suviniścitārthaḥ sarvadharmaparamapāramiprāptaḥ* rather differently: 我今所得一切諸法最上波羅蜜說真實義 (Among all the dharmas obtained today by me, the highest are the perfections by which [the Buddha] teaches the truth).

21. *Brahmacaryaṃ* generally refers to the practice of celibacy, specifically during the student's apprenticeship under a guru in brahmanical usage. Buddhists came to use the term *brahma-* in a punning fashion to signify something that was truly excellent, thus "best, perfect"; see Norman 1991, 195, and Harvey 1995, 271–272, n. 4.

22. Skt. *merutejā,* but I follow de Jong (1953, 546) in reading *urutejā* instead (Tib. *gzi yaṅs*). This emendation restores the meter as well.

23. Dp adds "*pratyayabuddha*s and monks" (*yuanjue seng* 緣覺僧).

24. The fourfold *brahmavihāra* formula typically includes the mental attitudes of *maitrī* (loving kindness), compassion *(karuṇā),* joy *(muditā),* and impartiality *(upekṣā).* See Miller 1979; she includes an extensive list of occurrences of this formula in Pāli and Buddhist Sanskrit literature (218–219). K. R. Norman has speculated that the term *brahmavihāra* was originally co-opted from brahmanical usage, where it would have signified "dwelling in or with *brahman* or Brahmā" (1991, 195–196).

25. Dp seems to have taken *abhirarāja* (shone) as "king" (*fu wei wang* 復為王).

26. Dp has mistakenly interpreted *varasatvaḥ* as "bodhisattvas of superior standing" (*shang wei zhu pusa* 上位諸菩薩).

27. *Jñāna-* is not represented in Jg.

28. Shackleton Bailey reads *anuśāsan* with Tib. *ston pa* (1954, 80), but I have retained the reading of the Skt. *(anubhāsan),* which I think fits the context better.

29. Dp's rendering of *kṛpāśayabuddhiḥ* is bizarre: *wo fo cibei yi rushi* 我佛慈悲亦如是 (Our Buddha is compassionate also in this way).

30. I follow de Jong (1967, 4) in reading *sarvān* (all) with Tib. here *(kun snaṅ)* in place of Skt. *satvān.* Jg renders this as *wubianjie* 無邊界 (without limit).

31. I read *maharṣeḥ* with Shackleton Bailey (1954, 80) in place of *maharṣiḥ.*

32. For *śūnyanirātma-* Jg has *wuwo kong wuyuan* 無我空無願 (without self, empty, and without aim).

33. Dp renders *paratīrthyān* as *zhu mo* 諸魔 (the Māras).

34. The first epithet in this line is difficult to construe. The Skt. reads *rūpasāgarabuddhiṃ,* which not only violates the meter but is patently incoherent. Tib.

reads *grags pa dam pa rgya chen thugs mṅa'*, which suggests *yaśa-*. Shackleton Bailey, recognizing the inherent difficulty of both readings, suggested an emendation to *kṛpa-* (1954, 82). Both Jg and Dp differ in significant ways and therefore do nothing to clarify the reading here. Given the intractable difficulties, I have accepted Shackleton Bailey's emendation.

35. The transcription of Rāṣṭrapāla's name in Dh, *lai zha he luo* 賴吒和羅 (*lat tra γwa la; see Coblin 1983, 252), suggests an underlying MIA form RaṭṭhavÆla.

36. Dp adds "who had only recently generated the aspiration [for enlightenment]" (*chu fa xin zhe* 初發心者), i.e., novice bodhisattvas.

37. Another sizable gap occurs at this point in Dh (= Finot 1901, 5.5–8.6).

38. In Dp's translation, the word "ocean" is put at the end of v. 14 (*san you hai* 三有海, "the ocean of the three realms of existence") and not here in v. 15 as in the Skt. Unless Dp's Indic manuscript had such a variant, it is possible that an eye skip is involved, especially in light of the fact that *pāda* d of both verses ends with the word *muniṃ.*

39. The translation of *koṭi* and *niyuta* or *nayuta* is difficult. *Koṭi* generally signifies ten million, but *nayuta* can be equivalent to one hundred thousand, one million, or one hundred billion, depending on the source. Since I do not believe that the authors of the *RP* intended to give precise figures, but rather numbers of incredible size (one is tempted to render such numbers as "gazillions"), I have translated *koṭi* as millions and *nayuta* as billions, unless a more precise figure seemed appropriate.

40. Skt. *prajñupāya sada pāramiṃgatā;* Tib. reads *śes rab thabs daṅ dbaṅ gi pha rol gśegs,* suggesting a reading *prajñupāyavaśipāramiṃgatā.* I have read with the Skt.

41. Note that this line offers an alternative list of the well-known perfections, here adding *upāya* (stratagems) to the traditional list of six. Cf. v. 166 below, where this same list of seven perfections appears (with *dāna* assumed in the context). But note also, however, that in v. 107, the perfections are specifically numbered as six.

42. MS: *ṛddhipāvara-*. I read with Finot: *ṛddhipādavara-*.

43. Dp appears to have taken *nayamukhena* as *kāyamukhena* (*suoyou shen kou* 所有身口), resulting in an incoherent translation.

44. *Pāda* a in Skt. reads *rāgadoṣaja hi mohasaṃbhavaṃ;* Tib. appears to have read *rāgadoṣa jaha mohasaṃbhavaṃ ('dod chags źe sdaṅ gti mug 'byuṅ ba spoṅ),* which makes no sense in the context.

45. For *naradevapūjitāḥ,* Dp translates *tian ren shi* 天人師 (teachers of gods and men), as if from *naradeva-paṇḍitāḥ.*

46. I follow de Jong (1953, 547) and Shackleton Bailey (1954, 80) in reading *pāda* a as *kṣetraśuddhiparivāra-saṃpado* in light of Tib. *dag pa'i źiṅ daṅ phun sum tshogs 'khor daṅ.* In confirmation of this reading, *pāda* a of v. 43 has exactly the same Tib. translation and the Skt. (Finot 1901, 9.3) reads as reconstructed here.

47. Jg and Dp add *pratyayabuddha*s (*yuanjue* 緣覺) here as well.

48. *Pāda* c of the Skt. is incoherent *(sarvadharmanayayuktamānasā),* so I have read with the Tib. *(chos rnams kun la thugs ni chags mi mṅa').* De Jong tentatively proposed reading *sarvadharma na p(r)ayuktamānasā* (1967, 5). Jg does little to clarify the passage: *ru yu yiqie fa zhi zhong* 入於一切法智中 (penetrate into the wisdom of all

things). Dp similarly obscures his underlying Indic text: *rushi yiqie fangbian fa* 如是一切方便法 (likewise with regard to all stratagems and dharmas?).

49. I read *rūpam* in place of *rūpyam* as suggested by Shackleton Bailey (1954, 80). Cf. Tib. *gzugs.*

50. The *Akaniṣṭha* gods are not mentioned in Jg.

51. Skt. *virājite.* Finot (1901, 6, n. 3) suggested emending to *virājate* (= *virājante*) and La Vallée Poussin (1903, 311) suggested *virājire,* but I have followed Edgerton (*BHSG* §8.80) in reading *virājite* as a past passive participle (nom. pl. in -e). Tib. *mdzes ma lags* appears to support this.

52. See Durt 1979 for an impressive marshaling of sources related to the occurence of the term *uṣṇīṣa* throughout Buddhist literature.

53. Jg appears to have understood *pāda* c differently: *ruo you ding li shizun zhe* 若有頂禮世尊者 (If those who bow their heads before the Blessed One . . .).

54. The Buddha is described in some texts as endowed with seven spiritual treasures, typically listed as *śraddhā, śīla, hrī, apatrāpya, śruta, tyāga, prajñā* (faith, morality, modesty, decorum, learning, renunciation, wisdom); see among other canonical citations, *DN* III, 163 and 251. These are contrasted with the seven worldly treasures possessed by a *cakravartin* king; see DN I, 88–89, and II, 172–177.

55. *Dharmacaryā,* traditionally listed as ten actions having to do with the preservation and dissemination of the Dharma; see *Mahāvyutpatti* 902–912 and *BHSD* 278.

56. For *maitra-varma* Dp read *maitra-dharma* (*cibei fa* 慈悲法).

57. *Kleśa*s are mental impurities or depravities that are closely associated with *anuśaya* (malefic proclivities) in the scholastic literature and are the root of continued existence in *saṃsāra.* For a typical list of the *kleśa*s, see *BHSD* 198. The whole of chapter 5 of Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* is dedicated to a discussion of *kleśa*s and related themes; see La Vallée Poussin [1923–1931] 1980, IV, 1–118.

58. MS reads *pṛcchaseyam,* but I read *pṛccheyam* with Finot, who emended the text without comment.

59. Skt. *satvadharma-*; I read with Tib. *chos thams cad,* reflecting a probable *sarvadharma-*. All three Chin. translations confirm this reading.

60. Dh's *wu dong wei zhi hui* 無動畏之慧 (wisdom not affected by fear) would appear to reflect a confusion between *aparādhīna-* (not dependent upon another) and *aparidīna-* (not distressed, timid). Jg also has a rendering quite different from the Skt.: *dao jiujing chu er de zizai* 到究竟處而得自在 (he reaches the highest stage and acquires self-mastery). Dp translates simply as "unobstructed gnosis" (*wuai da zhi* 無礙大智).

61. Finot reads *bhūtasaṃghāya-* instead of *bhūtasaṃdhāya-* (so MS). Dh renders *bhūtasaṃdhāyavacanaṃ* as *suowen zhu fo* 所問諸佛 (when he questions the buddhas . . .). At the heart of Dh's mistranslation is his confusion of *bhūta* and buddha. On the translation process that made such kinds of confusions possible, see the discussion in Chapter 5. For examples of this very same confusion elsewhere in Dh's corpus, see Boucher 1998, 480.

62. Tib. reads *sems can gyi khams la mkhas pa,* suggesting *satvadhātu-*. See de Jong 1967, 5.

63. Dp has collapsed (*satva-)kauśalyatāṃ ca buddhānusmṛtipratilābhaṃ* together: *nian fo fangbian* 念佛方便 (mindfully recollecting the Buddha's stratagems).

64. For *jñānasāgara-* Dh has *juzu zhihui* 具足智慧 (replete with wisdom), suggesting that he or his committee understood his Indic original as *ñÆna-saghÆra* (= *saṃskāra*). For an explanation of this confusion and a discussion of its implications, see Chapter 5.

65. Tib. adds *byaṅ chub (spyod) = bodhi (caryam).*

66. Skt. *jñānalotu;* I follow Tib. *ye śes . . . 'thob par 'gyur* (= *jñānalābhu*). Jg reads "imperishable profit" (*wujin li* 無盡利), suggesting that he too read *-lābha* in place of *-lotu* but without *jñāna-*.

67. *Amṛta* (ambrosia) is here rendered by Dh as *wuliang* 無量, representing a confusion with *amita* (boundless, immeasurable), which is quite possibly the MIA form in which it was written in Dh's manuscript. On this confusion in Chinese translations generally, see Iwamatsu 1982.

68. For *satvakāraṇakathā niruttarā,* Dh has *yiqie suoyun wei jimo* 一切所云為寂寞 (everything that is spoken concerns quiescence). There appear to be two separate problems here. First, Dh seems to have read *sarva-* in place of *satva-*, an alternation that takes place occasionally in our Nepalese manuscript and Tibetan translation as well. Second, he appears to have confused *niruttarā* with *nirvṛtti,* presumably because the former occurred in a MIA form that at least partially overlapped with the latter. Cf. *nivruda* (= *nivṛti*) of the Khotan *Dharmapada,* v. 159 (Brough 1962, 144).

69. Finot read *dharmanetri rayina* in *pāda* c, but the MS should be read *dharmanetrir api na,* which Tib. *chos kyi tshul yaṅ* seems to confirm. See also La Vallée Poussin 1903, 311. Dp has taken *-netrī-* (rule, method, way) as *-netrā-* (eyes): *fa yan* 法眼.

70. I read *vihato* with de Jong (1967, 5) in place of *vihito;* cf. Tib. *bzlog pa.*

71. For *deśanāsamaya* Dh has *suojiang xi pingdeng* 所講悉平等 (the discourse is completely uniform). I suspect the source of the confusion here is that Dh read a *kharoṣṭhī* manuscript (in Gāndhārī Prakrit or Gāndhārī Hybrid Sanskrit) that had *samaka* in place of *samaya,* reflecting the use of the graph -k- (= ø) to indicate the further weakening of the semivowel in intervocalic position. See Brough 1962, §38, for a discussion of this phenomenon. Dh was apparently unaware of this convention or else mistook it in this context.

72. Note that Dp has read *-śrāvaṇe* at the end of *pāda* d as *-śramaṇa: ji bi shengwen yuanjue xing* 及彼聲聞緣覺性 (and those having the natures of *śramaṇa*s or *pratyayabuddha*s). Elsewhere in the *RP, śravaṇa* is indeed equivalent to *śramaṇa* (Finot 1901, 17.13 and 34.12). Dp's understanding of the second line then is, not surprisingly, at considerable variance to the Skt.: "May the Buddha teach with stratagems according to the predilections [of his audience; in this way] the Teacher encounters the assembly at just the right time" (願佛隨根方便說 師資遇會正是時).

73. Dh uses the locution *tianzhongtian* 天中天 (god among the gods) here for *jina* (or perhaps *mune*), though it more often serves as an equivalent for *bhagavat* in his translations and those of other, particularly Yuezhi, translators. See the discussion of this locution in Iwamatsu 1985. The inspiration for this locution is almost certainly Iranian rather than Indian, modeled on the royal title "supreme king of the kings." On the use of this lat-

ter epithet among Achaemenid and Parthian rulers, see Wolski 1990; it also shows up on Kushan coins in Bactrian (ραονανο ραο), on which see Gauthiot 1911. This epithet for the Buddha occurs later in Khotanese *(gyastānu gyastä),* where it also served as an equivalent of Skt. *bhagavat* (see Emmerick 1983, 17-18), and in Tokharian *(ñäkteṃts ñakte)* and Uighur *(tängri tängrisi).* It is found already in some Pāli texts, but apparently only in the later strata of the canon (and prominently in the *Milindapañha,* which itself may have received some Iranian influence in the Northwest); see Endo 1990, 162-163.

74. Dp has taken considerable liberties with this verse, introducing a discourse on the "vehicles" that is absent from all other versions. It is worth citing in full: 我今樂聞最上乘 唯佛知我菩提性 於此小乘不樂求 願說如來第一法 (Today I take pleasure in hearing about the highest vehicle; only the Buddha knows my disposition toward enlightenment. I do not take pleasure in seeking after the Small Vehicle. May you elucidate the supreme Dharma of the Realized One).

75. Finot reads *yad utārāyādhyāśayapratipattyā* but the MS reads *yad utāsayādhyāsayapratipattyā.* (I take *āsaya* and *adhyāsaya* here for *āśaya* and *adhyāśaya* respectively.) Cf. Tib. *bsam pa daṅ lhag pa'i bsam pas nan tan byed pa.* Dh's rendering does not appear to reflect the Indic text directly: *xing pingdeng xin er wu yuchan* 行平等心而無諛諂 (practice equanimity without currying favor). Note, however, that Jg's translation appears in part to accord with Dh's: *zhenshi xin wu chanqu* 真實心無諂曲 (having genuine thoughts, undisturbed by fawning). Dp is quite different from any of the above: *chen li zhen shi* 稱理真實 (accord with principle and truth?).

76. Skt. *iyam atra dharmatā.* The authors have co-opted here a clause known from earlier canonical literature, notably the *Mahāpadānasutta/Mahāvadānasūtra,* in which each of the events in the conception, birth, and life of a buddha is declared to occur according to an established rule. See *DN* II, 12.5, 20, 25, 13.2, and so forth; Waldschmidt 1956, 83 ff.; and now Fukita 2003, 34.10, 36.10, 38.7-8, and so forth. On the significance of this clause, see Fukita 1993, 278-281. This clause is omitted from all three Chinese translations.

77. Most of the verses recapitulating the prose sections concerning the various fourfold sets of attributes of bodhisattvas are missing in Dh. Note in this regard that these verses are introduced by the clause *tatredam ucyate,* without mention of a speaker, suggesting that they may be later interpolations for which their author was uncomfortable claiming the status of *buddhavacana.*

78. The Skt. reads *anāyakān* (without leader, guide) here, but I accept Edgerton's suggestion (*BHSD* 21) that we should understand *anayakān,* the *ā* being *metri causa* for *a.* Cf. the nearly parallel expression in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* (KN 162.1): *anāyikeyaṃ praja sarvaduḥkhitā* (these people, unfortunate and afflicted in every way . . .). Jg, however, clearly read *anāyakān* (*wu jiuhu* 無救護). Dp reads *anāyakān* as *wuwo* 無我 (without self), which is clearly unexpected, though Seishi Karashima has suggested to me (personal communication, July 2006) that *wo* 我 could be a graphic mistake for *jiu* 救.

79. *Pāda* c reads *tāraṇārtha bhavato jagat,* but it is clearly defective. Shackleton Bailey (1954, 80) suggested *bhava<sāra>to,* but I read *bhavasāgarāt,* following Tib. *srid pa'i mtsho las,* which also fits the meter. Jg's *yu you hai* 於有海 (from the ocean of

existence) and Dp's *san you da hai zhong* 三有大海中 (within the ocean of the triple existence) support this reading as well.

80. The various kinds of emptiness are listed in sources as eighteen in number (see *Mahāvyutpatti* 933–951) or as twenty, the latter number seemingly common in the Perfection of Wisdom literature; see Conze 1975, 144–148, for a representative list. See also *BHSD* 532 for a list of the twenty kinds included in the *Dharmasaṃgraha.* Jg renders *pāda* a as follows: "While walking, standing, sitting, or lying down, [the bodhisattva] reflects upon emptiness" (*xing zhu zuo wo nian kongmen* 行住坐臥念空門).

81. The second line of Dp's translation is quite different: 譬如夢幻等無實 令彼愚迷生智慧 (Like a dream, an illusion, and so on, is that which is without foundation, which causes the bewildered to generate gnosis).

82. On *dhāraṇīpratilābha,* see Lamotte 1944–1980, 1: 317–321.

83. *gambhīradharmakṣānti. Kṣānti* is notoriously difficult to translate. In some contexts it means "forbearance," especially insofar as it indicates the virtue of a bodhisattva to endure hardship and abuse, and in others "tolerance," in contexts where it implies an ability to be intellectually receptive to difficult to fathom doctrines (I have generally opted for the latter translation). But I agree with Jan Nattier (contra Pagel 1995, 182–183, n. 228) that we are not dealing with two separate denotations of this term, but rather with two fundamentally compatible extensions of its root meaning, namely, "to endure," or in the vernacular, "to stomach" that which is difficult to bear. See Nattier 2003, 244, n. 240.

84. Note that this line confirms that *dhāraṇī,* rather than being "magical utterances," are in fact connected to what their etymology suggests: mnemonic devices to remember and hence preserve the Dharma in an oral context; see the useful note in Nattier 2003, 291–292, n. 549. Many contemporary scholars continue unnecessarily to link the use of *dhāraṇī* with Tantric/Vajrayāna Buddhism and its use of magical spells. See, for example, Williams 2000, 205–206 (in the contribution by Anthony Tribe). I am much more sympathetic with Matthew Kapstein's recent discussion of the role of *dhāraṇī* in normative Mahāyāna practice as reflected in some of its scholastic literature (2001, 233–255).

85. Skt. reads *sati* here, though I assume this to be a mistake for *mati* (Tib. *blo gros*). Jg reads *zhihui* 智慧 (wisdom).

86. Tib. reads *dpa' bo* here, suggesting that its underlying Skt. was *vīra* instead of *dhīra.* Note also that *dhīra* here and in vv. 58, 68, and 106 could also mean "wise" (see Norman [1997] 2000, 67, n. 23). I have followed the interpretation of the Tib. *(brtan pa)* in these other verses in rendering it "resolute."

87. Although the Skt. text has only *buddhadarśanaṃ* here, Dh's translation has the appearance of an extended gloss, perhaps by Dh to members of his translation committee: 菩薩示現佛身入於生死 勸諸起滅者令得喜悅法 (bodhisattvas manifest the Buddha's body as having entered *saṃsāra;* they admonish those in *saṃsāra* [lit. "those who arise and perish"?], causing them to take pleasure in the Dharma). This translation is uncertain.

88. Skt. *anupalambhadharmakṣānti.* Dh's *bu qi fa ren* 不起法忍 suggests *anutpattikadharmakṣānti.* Jg's *shun fa ren* 順法忍 suggests *anulomadharmakṣānti.* Dp renders as *ren yin wuxiang shen fa* 忍印無相深法; it is unclear exactly to what this latter rendering would correspond.

89. Finot read *sarvajotiṣu,* but the MS unambiguously reads *sarvajātiṣu;* Tib. *tshe rabs kun tu* confirms this reading.

90. For *pūjayaṃs tathā narendrarāja* Jg has *ru tian feng dishi* 如天奉帝釋 (like the gods revering Śakra, lord [of the gods]).

91. Jg's *suishun fa* 隨順法 suggests that he understood *anulomikadharma* instead of *anopalambhadharma.*

92. Skt. *satvadharma.* I read *sarvadharma* with Tib. *chos 'di thams cad* and Jg *zhu fa* 諸法.

93. After *agraho* the MS reads *na vidyate,* which is omitted without comment in Finot's edition. The additional syllables make the already irregular verse hypermetric.

94. Although Finot's edition omits it, this line ends with *kvacit* in the MS (Finot 1901, 12, n. 3), corresponding to Tib. *gaṅ du 'aṅ.*

95. There appears to be some confusion in Dp's translation at this point. Two lines follow his translation of v. 59 that appear to belong to the end of v. 58: 若聞無相甚深法性離分別本來空 無我無人無眾生 如是於斯生愛樂 (If he listens to the profound Dharma, which is without characteristics, whose nature is devoid of distinctions, and is fundamentally empty, without "self," without "person," without "being," in this way does he give rise to joy in it [i.e., the Dharma]).

96. On the central importance of a bodhisattva's indifference to profit and honor for the authors of the *RP,* see Chapter 4.

97. Skt. *kulasaṃstava.* The word *kula-* literally means "family," but it generally in Sanskrit and certainly in the *RP* has more the nuance of upper-class families, especially those with the means to patronize the professional religious. Jg's translation makes this understanding explicit, rendering *kula-* as *tanyue* 檀越 (= *dānapati,* "donor"). Intimacy with such families is throughout the *RP* seen as dangerous to the bodhisattva's personal integrity. Dp has interpreted this compound quite differently: *bu de aiyao shang zu zhong sheng* 不得愛樂上族中生 (he does not obtain pleasure by being born in upper-class families). Dh does not appear to have an equivalent for *kulasaṃstava: pusa bu qiu zhu gongde bao* 菩薩不求諸功德報 (a bodhisattva does not seek recompense for virtue). His Indic manuscript may have contained a variant for this item, but it is also possible that this translation is yet another instance of an interpretive gloss by Dh for the benefit of his translation assistants.

98. Dp's rendering of *kāyajīvitād* is quite unexpected: *xiaosheng zhi ren* 小乘之人 (people of the Small Vehicle). Curiously, in the following v. 62, which recapitulates this prose passage, Dp's translation essentially captures the sense of the extant Skt. text: *bu xi shen ming ji juanshu* 不惜身命及眷屬 ([the bodhisattva] does not hold dear his body, life, or relatives). And yet, immediately thereafter, Dp adds the following remark not included in the Skt.: 於小乘法無所著 於最上乘恆堅固 ([the bodhisattva] is without attachment to the teachings of the Small Vehicle, and he is always firm in his commitment to the highest vehicle). Once again, it seems that this "vehicle" rhetoric has been inserted by Dp or by members of his translation team.

99. The following six lines (v. 60 and the first half of v. 61) are quoted at *Śikṣ* 196.1–6. The Tibetan translation of the *Śikṣ* cites the following twelve lines (vv. 60–62), suggesting that its translators made use of independent canonical texts; see Bendall 1897–1902, 196,

n.5, on this passage, and Silk 1994, 649–651, and Klaus 1997 on the Tib. *Śikṣ.* more generally.

100. Skt. *cintānapekṣā,* but I follow de Jong (1953, 547) and Shackleton Bailey (1954, 80) in reading *vittānapekṣā* (Tib. *nor mi blta*). However, Dp's *ling xin wu suozhuo* 令心無所著 (makes his thoughts unattached) may reflect an underlying *cintā-*. *Śikṣ* 196.1 also reads *cintā-*.

101. On the importance of wilderness dwelling for the *RP,* see Chapter 3.

102. *Śikṣ* 196.3 reads *strīsaṃbhava* in place of *strīsaṃstavu.*

103. I read with *Śikṣ* 196.4 *khaḍgasadṛśāḥ* in place of *khaḍgavimalāḥ.* Tib. appears to confirm this reading: *bse ltar gcig pur gnas.* Jg's *piru xi yi jiao* 譬如犀一角 (like the single horn of a rhinoceros) suggests that his Indic text may have read *khaḍgaviṣāṇa* instead of *khaḍgavimalāḥ.* Curiously, Dp appears not to have recognized the metonymic nuance of the word *khaḍga* (rhinoceros) here and translated it literally as "sharp sword" (*qingjing ru li jian* 清淨如利劍). There has been some controversy among Indologists as to the precise meaning of *khaḍga,* particularly in the compound *khaḍga-viṣāṇa;* for a discussion of this debate, see Salomon 2000, 10–14.

104. Śikṣ 196.5 reads *harṣa svamano* in place of *harṣita mano.*

105. The authors of the *RP* are particularly harsh in their condemnation of their monastic bretheren who unduly manipulate or even blatantly extort patrons for their own advantage. For further discussion, see Chapter 4.

106. Dh renders as *yu fa wu yanzu* 於法無厭足 (without satiety in the Dharma). It seems likely that Dh understood *ananutāpa-* as derived from *anu√tṛp* (to be satiated), possibly because both words could have phonologically overlapped in the language of his manuscript.

107. MS *araṇyavāsānutsyajanatā.* Contra Finot's proposed *araṇyavāsākutsyajanatā,* I follow the Tib. here, *dgon pa la gnas pa mi gtoṅ ba,* which probably corresponds to Skt. *-anutsarjanatā,* as suggested by de Jong (1953, 547) and Shackleton Bailey (1954, 80).

108. *caturṇām āryavaṃśānām anuvartanatā.* There are a number of interesting problems related to the four *āryavaṃśa*s, and there is a sizable literature that has addressed them. First of all, I take *ārya-* here as referring to the "spiritually ennobled," traditionally defined as a buddha, a *pratyekabuddha,* or a *śrāvaka* of a buddha who has attained to at least the first of four fruits along the path to arhatship (see *CPD,* vol. 1, 428–429, and also Norman 1990b), co-opting the brahmanical use of *ārya* as noble by birth/caste. On the sense of *-vaṃśa* in this compound and its relationship to the term *gotra* in Buddhist literature, see Takasaki 1967 and Ruegg 1969, 457–458. Other studies of the *āryavaṃśa*s include Rahula 1943 and 1956, 268–273; Mori 1989 and 1993 (essentially an English translation of the former); Witanachchi 1966 (which seems entirely dependent upon Rahula); and Hirakawa [1968] 1989/1990, 2: 153–177 (especially in relationship to its occurrence in the *Ugraparipṛcchā-sūtra*). There are a number of canonical occurrences and discussions of this term: *DN* III, 224–225; *DĀ,* T 1, 1: 51a.1–8; *AN* II, 27–28; *MĀ,* T 26, 1: 563b.28–c.11; *Jātaka* II, 441; *Paṭisambhidāmagga* I, 84; *Mahāniddesa* II, 497; *Cullaniddesa* 106. As several authors have already discussed, all lists of the

*āryavaṃśa*s agree on the first three "traditions" or monastic dispositions: a monk is to be content with any robe whatsoever, with any almsfood, and with any lodging (lit. "beds and seats"). For the fourth item, some lists include contentment with any medicine (e.g., *DĀ,* 1: 51a.7; *Pinimu jing,* T 1463, 24: 804c.17–18; *Mahaniddesa* II, 497), while other lists describe the fourth tradition as delight in abandonment and mental cultivation (e.g., *DN* III, 225; *AN* II, 28; *MĀ,* 1: 563c.5–7; *Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya,* La Vallée Poussin [1923–1931] 1980, 4, 146–148). Some scholars have attempted to discern sectarian or chronological differences in these two lists, but none of these arguments seems decisive (e.g., the Theravādin tradition knows both lists within its canon). This locution also occurs in Mahāyāna literature other than the *RP: KP* 6.17, 123.3, 126.7; *RR* I.2 (57), II.14, VII.8; and an extended discussion in the *UP,* Stog vol. 39 (Ca), 31b3–32b7. Interestingly, the Tibetan translation of the *UP* (in contrast to its three Chinese translations) fuses the two lists into five items; see Nattier 2003, 127–130 and 282–284. Sinhalese *Aṭṭhakathā* literature also appears to have combined the two lists into five items; see Mori 1993, 103–104.

109. In each of the four items above, Dp states the opposite of what we would expect on the basis of all other versions. Thus, for *śīlākhaṇḍanatā* (not breaking moral conduct), Dp renders *pofan jielü* 破犯戒律 (violates the precepts); for **araṇyavāsānusarjanatā,* Dp has *bu zhu shanye er qu jijing* 不住山野而趣寂靜 ([the bodhisattva does not dwell in the wilderness yet enters quiescence), and so on.

110. Contra Finot's emendation to *anuśīla susaṃyato,* I read with the MS: *aha śīlasusaṃyato* (cf. Tib. *ṅa ni khrims ldan legs sdom yin*). See also Ensink 1952, 15, n. 74.

111. Tib. has no equivalent of *śubhe.*

112. Skt. reads *satvarūpaṃ,* but clearly the context requires us to understand *sarvarūpaṃ,* as confirmed by the Tib. *(gzugs kun);* see Shackleton Bailey 1954, 80.

113. Although Finot read *-kutha-* here and emended it to *-kotha-* in his edition, the MS actually reads *-kuḍya,* which is confirmed by Tib. *rtsig pa.*

114. Dp's *da zhangfu* 大丈夫 (great man) for *-mahānubhāvam* is unexpected.

115. Tib. *bde bar gśegs pa'i yon tan* suggests *sugataguṇa.* I have rendered the Skt.

116. Skt. *bhavacārake.* Tib. reads *srid pa'i btson ra* (reading with the Stog Palace MS), suggesting "prison of existence" (so translated by Ensink 1952, 15). But I follow Edgerton (*BHSD* 228) in understanding *-cāraka* as "stream, course (of a river)," which fits the context here quite well.

117. Finot read *sa tārayanti,* though the MS clearly reads *saṃtārayanti.* See Ensink 1952, 15, n. 76.

118. Note again the introduction here of "vehicle" rhetoric in Dp's translation: 是故小乘非究竟 為生令發菩提心 (Therefore the Small Vehicle is not the ultimate for generating and causing others to develop the aspiration for enlightenment).

119. Skt. *ājāneyagatayo. Ājāneya* (lit. "of noble blood, thoroughbred") here evokes an image, rather common in Mahāyāna *sūtra* literature, of the elite lineage of the bodhisattva by using a metaphor referring to livestock. To this end it is sometimes contrasted with *khaḍuṅka* (var. *khaṭuṅka*) (unruly, unmanageable), again likening undisciplined bodhisattvas to horses that have not been bridled and trained. See *BHSD* 90 and 202 respectively, and for examples in the literature, *KP* 9 and 10, and also *RP* 58.6. For

further discussion of the terms *khatuṅka* and *ājāneya* in the *Ratnakūṭa* collection, see Hachiriki 1989, esp. 422–427. Dh's rendering of this term, *wu nian* 無念, suggests that he understood *ajñeya* (unknowable). This is one of a number of Indian metaphors lost on Dh and his translation committee.

120. Dh's rendering of *prāntaśayyāsanābhiratiḥ* is problematic albeit interesting: *yao shou jiaoming* 樂受教命 (takes pleasure in receiving the teachings). We may be able to make sense of this misconstrual if we assume Dh to have been working from a *kharoṣṭhī* manuscript. In such a case he could have misread *-śayyāsana-* as *-[śa]śasana-* (teachings) on account of the close graphic similarity of *ya* and *śa* in late forms of *kharoṣṭhī* script. We might also presume that he read *prānta-* (perhaps *prÆta* in his manuscript) as derived from *prāpta*, "obtained" (for *prata* = *prāpta* in Gāndhārī, see Brough 1962, 119 [v. 5] and 137 [v. 128]). See also Chapter 6 for a further discussion of such evidence for the underlying script and language of Dh's Indic manuscript.

121. Jg has a slight variant here: *de wu ai bian toutuo ren fa* 得無礙辯頭陀忍法 (he obtains unobstructed eloquence, ascetic discipline *[dhuta]*, and tolerance for the Dharma).

122. *prapañcāḥ.* This term is difficult to translate, especially given that it carries a range of nuances in different canonical and commentarial contexts. My translation follows that of Schmithausen 1987, pt. 2: 356, n. 510, and 509, n. 1405. See also *BHSD* 380–381. On the use of this term in the Pāli canon, see Sakurabe 1991. Nothing reflecting *vigataprapañcāḥ* is translated in Jg. Dp renders this compound as *li zhu chen* 離諸塵 (devoid of defilements).

123. Dp transposes vv. 68 and 70.

124. Finot reads *mahāśayānāṃ*, but the MS clearly reads *mahāyaśānāṃ.* See Ensink 1952, 16, n. 79.

125. MS: *samādapenti* (contra Finot's *samādayanti*).

126. *kuśaleṣu daśasu.* A clear reference to the ten *karmapatha;* see *BHSD* 170–171; Hirakawa 1963, 73–79, and [1968] 1989/1990, 2: 16–43.

127. The form *mociṣya* (m.c. for *mociṣye*) seems to have perplexed Edgerton, who wrote: "Twice in RP occur forms in *iṣya* which seem clearly used as 3 sg. or pl.; both in verses, meter requiring short final: *mociṣya* 15.8; *bhaviṣya* 29.12. Should they be regarded as historically 1 sg. forms used as 3 sg. or pl. (§ 25.27)? . . . Or are they based on 3 person forms, originally with secondary endings (like the 1 sg. in *syam*), with final *a* m.c. for *at, an*?" (*BHSG* § 31.34). It seems clear to me in the context that we must be dealing here with a future first person singular *ātmanepada* form in *-iṣye* in a direct construction expressing the subject's resolve.

128. Tib. reads quite differently here: *khoṅ khro ba med pa'i sems byaṅ chub sems dpa'i spyod pa* (the bodhisattva course for one whose thoughts are without anger). Dh and Jg agree with the Tib. while Dp appears to accord with the Skt., although not closely: *shen xin jueding zhi qiu puti* 身心決定志求菩提 (to be firmly resolved in mind and body as one earnestly seeks enlightenment).

129. Tib. seems to have understood *pādas* a and b in unexpected ways. For *gṛham ativiṣaṃ,* Tib. has *khyim gyi blo gros ya ṅa,* suggesting that the translators understood

gṛha-mati viṣaṃ (thoughts of the household that are poisonous). Finot read *pāda* b as *kujanasamāgamayonim asya* (MS: *-yonisasya*) *dūram,* but Tib. seems to have understood *-yoniśas dūram (skye bo ṅan 'grogs tshul bźin riṅ 'gyur ba).* It is difficult to know how to construe this latter reading.

130. Curiously, Dh has *qi xin bu zhuo cai li se* 其心不著財利色 (his mind is not attached to wealth, profit, or sensuality). I have no explanation for this except to point out that *jñātra* (reputation) is regularly misconstrued by Dh throughout this translation. Jg also regularly misunderstands the sense of *jñātra,* here translating this passage as *yong duan juanshu en'ai nian* 永斷眷屬恩愛念 (perpetually cutting off thoughts of affection for relatives), confusing *jñātra* with *jñāti* (relatives) as elsewhere. Dp takes *sarvajñātralābhe* as *neng cheng rulai wuai zhi* 能成如來無礙智 (they are able to attain to the unobstructed gnosis of the Realized One).

131. The Skt. appears to be corrupt here: *viharati siṃha ivottrasañ jitāriṃ* (MS: *-jitāri*); the Tib. clarifies the clause somewhat but is not exactly parallel: *seṅ ge lta bur gnas śiṅ dgra las rgyal* (abides like a lion, victorious over enemies). For this reason I have adopted the emendation suggested tentatively by de Jong (1953, 547): *siṃha ivātrasañ jitāri[ḥ].*

132. Dh's rendering here is difficult to explain: *piru fei niao wu suowei* 譬如飛鳥無所畏 (like a flying bird, he is without fear).

133. This passage is reminiscent of a discipline often engaged in by brahmanical ascetics, namely, living and collecting food in the manner of animals. Such lifestyle choices were designed to highlight the ascetic's distance if not outright opposition to human society and culture by such a stark return to the wilderness. See the extended discussion of these features of brahmanical asceticism in Olivelle 1991 and 1992, esp. 101–112. Buddhist sources typically reject the more extreme of these austerities; see, e.g., *DN* III, 6–9, and *MN* I, 77–81.

134. Dh's rendering here is again difficult to account for: *yiqie shijian wu suochang* 一切世間無所常 (the whole world is without permanence). One might suspect that Dh had in some fashion mistaken *niketu* for *nitya* (< Gdh. *nice tu?*), but this is difficult to explain on purely phonological grounds.

135. Jg's translation is quite different: *wei zhu fannao ru yeshou* 畏諸煩惱如野獸 (he fears the defilements [*kleśa*s] as if they were wild animals).

136. Dh appears to have had an Indic text quite different from our Nepalese manuscript, or else he missed the sense of *pāda*s a and b in significant ways: 捐去邪語及惡見智了大行志解道 (Relinquishing depraved speech and wrong views, he understands the great practice and is intent upon the path to liberation).

137. Skt. *smitābhilāṣī;* I follow the Tib. here: *'dzum pa'i bźin gyis . . . smra źiṅ.* Shackleton Bailey (1954, 80) and Edgerton (1954, 169) suggested reading *-abhilāpī* instead.

138. Dp adds *apraṇihita,* "aimlessness" (*wu yuan* 無願).

139. Skt. *prativadasi.* I follow Tib. *sgrub byed,* on which basis Ensink (1952, 17, n. 89) proposed *pratipadati.*

140. Skt. reads *dhāraṇīpratilābham* here, whereas the Tib. suggests *dhāraṇīpratibhāṇam (gzuṅs daṅ spobs pa).* There are other instances of this substitution below.

Dh and Jg confirm the Tib. here, though there is a curious misreading in Dh's translation of this *pāda;* see Chapter 6 for further discussion.

141. Dh's *liao bui* 了穢 (knowing impurities) appears to reflect a confusion between √*jan* (to beget) and √*jñā* (to know).

142. For -*śāṭhyasevanatā* (fondness for deceit), Dh has *xi yu yuchan* 習於諛諂 (cultivate the currying of favor). It would appear that here, as elsewhere, Dh understood -*śāṭhya*- as from *1*√*śaṭh* (to praise, flatter) and not from *4*√*śaṭh* (to deceive, trick). See Monier-Williams [1899] 1986, 1048b. Jg has opted for the same interpretation: *chanqu* 諂曲 (distorted by fawning). Dp renders as follows: *xin wu xiao xing xiedai beini* 心無孝行懈怠背逆 (his thoughts are unfilial and his practice is slothful and pugnacious). It is not necessary to see this concern for filial piety as a Chinese intrusion into the translation; cf. v. 82 immediately following this prose section.

143. Jg adds "fame" (*mingwen* 名聞) as well.

144. The referent here is not entirely clear. The preceding prose section speaks of the pitfalls of bodhisattvas, so we should expect bodhisattvas to be the subject of these verses as well. However, v. 85 below specifically refers to monks *(bhikṣava)* who are unrestrained. Thus the verses may refer to monks in general or monastic bodhisattvas specifically.

145. MS: *akṛtajña aśaṭhāś.* My translation follows Finot's emendation to *akṛtajñaśaṭhāś* (Tib. *byas pa mi gzo g.yon can*).

146. For Skt. *śīlaguṇeṣu* (in morality and virtues) Tib. reads *tshul khrims brtul źugs,* suggesting an underlying *śīlavrateṣu* (in morality and religious vows). Jg appears to agree with Tib.: *chi jie ji ku xing* 持戒及苦行 ([I] maintain the precepts and arduous practices).

147. The last *pāda* of the Skt. appears to be corrupt: *śravaṇā hi sudūrata teṣām;* hence I have followed the Tib. here: *de dag dge sbyoṅ yon tan śin tu riṅ* (see Shackleton Bailey 1954, 80). *Śravaṇā* is written for *śramaṇā* here and at 34.12. This interchange is known elsewhere in Buddhist Sanskrit (*BHSD* 534) and is recorded by Hemacandra (Böhtlingk 1879–1989, fasc. 6, 269, citing Hemacandra's *Pariśiṣṭaparvan*). The alternation of -m- and -v- (or more precisely, a nasalized allophone of -v-) is common in the Prakrits; see Pischel [1955] 1981, §251; Brough 1962, §36; von Hinüber 2001, §§208–210. Cf. also Jg's and Dp's *shamen* 沙門 *(śramaṇa)* here as well.

148. *Paścimakāle;* Dp: *mofa zhi shi* 末法之時. On this equivalence, see Nattier 1991, 93, but also the discussion in Chapter 4.

149. Skt. *mokṣapathaṃ.* Tib. *'phags lam* (path of the Noble One), suggesting *āryapathaṃ.* Jg seems to confirm this reading, even specifying "eightfold noble path" (*ba zheng lu* 八正路).

150. All three Chin. translations reverse the order of the first two items in this list.

151. Dh's *qi xiang* 起想 (gives rise to thoughts) suggests that he took *māno* (arrogance, conceit) as from *manas* (mind, thoughts). Obviously this translation makes little sense in the context. Dp translates as *jidu* 嫉妒 (envy), perhaps influenced by the following item.

152. The following verse is cited at *Śikṣ* 203.9–10.

153. *Śikṣ* 203.10 reads *tyajati* in place of *tyaja.*

154. Again, Dh's order of these items is different from the Skt. and Tib.

155. For this felicitous rendering of *upalambhadṛṣṭika,* I am indebted to Jonathan Silk's unpublished translation of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* (*KP* 123.6 and 134.14). Within Mahāyāna *sūtra*s, relying upon *upalambha* (the process of [falsely] construing distinctions) is rejected as heretical (see *BHSD* 140).

156. *śuklapakṣe,* lit. "in the light half." Note the pun here with *śuklapakṣa* as "white party," i.e., the righteous (see *BHSD* 530).

157. The Tib. makes an unexpected mistake with regard to *pāda* d here: *gaṅ dag saṅs rgyas ye śes don mi gñer,* corresponding to Skt. *ye buddhajñānena bhavanti arthikāḥ.* It would seem that the Tib. translators took the instrumental *-jñānena* as *jñāne na,* thus misconstruing a negative with the opposite of the intended meaning.

158. For *viṣakumbhavat* Dp has *du qi* 毒氣 (poisonous gas). I have no explanation for this (could *qi* 氣 be a mistake for *qi* 器, "pot, vase"?).

159. Contra Finot's *agnikhadhāṃ,* the MS reads *agnikhadāṃ.* See Ensink 1952, 20, n. 105.

160. There are a number of problems with Dh's translation of this section that must be treated together. First, Dh combined items one and two of the Skt. into his first item. The third item of the Skt. *(anadhimuktī),* Dh's second, is rendered loosely: *xin bu huanyue wu qingjing xing* 心不歡悅無清淨行 (his thoughts take no pleasure in impure conduct). In this case it would appear that Dh took the *apariśuddha-* at the beginning of Skt. item number four *(apariśuddhajñānakṣāntisaṃbhogaparyeṣṭī)* and attached it to the end of his second item (= Skt. no. 3). This mistake would have been impossible if his Indic text looked like ours, with the refrain "is something that results in suffering for bodhisattvas" after each item. But if Dh's Indic manuscript was lacking such a refrain, as his translation suggests, this confusion becomes—at least structurally—conceivable. Since Dh's third item in effect translates Skt. item number four, he had to provide a fourth item to fill out the list, the source for which is entirely unclear to me: *wei you wo ren zhuo fa* 謂有我人著法 (is a thing that has attachment to "self" or "person"?). This section is a good example of the piecemeal translation style that characterizes much of Dh's idiom, especially in the early period of his translation career when the *Rāṣṭrapāla* was rendered.

161. Most of the items in this section differ markedly in Dp's translation and are thus worth citing in full: (1) "belittling the teaching" (*qingman jiaofa* 輕慢教法), (2) "attachment to 'self' and 'person' (*zhizhuo wo ren* 執著我 人), (3) "their minds have no faith in liberation" (*xin wu xinjie* 心無信解), (4) "within the impure realm, they are endowed with assurance"(?) (*yu bujing jing juzu yinchi* 於不淨境具足印持). Given that Dh's rendering of this section also diverges significantly from the Skt. text, it may be that different manuscript traditions contained variant readings of this section. Nevertheless, it is also likely that problems of translation are at work in both Dh and Dp independent of the Indic texts.

162. MS: *catvāro;* omitted by Finot.

163. Although the sense is not in doubt, *pāda* c is hypometric: *avamanyati tāniājñaḥ* (?). Finot proposed correcting it to *avamanyati tān iha ajñaḥ* (?). Tib. reads *de la mi śes pas ni brñas byed na,* which led Shackleton Bailey (1954, 81) to suggest *tān yadi ajñaḥ.* Neither of these proposals solves the metrical problems.

164. I agree with Ensink (1952, 20, n. 106) in reading Finot's *sa deśati* as *sa-d-eṣati,*

with -d- as a sandhi consonant (see *BHSG* §4.64) and a confusion of sibilants common to this MS. Cf. Tib. *gaṅ źig . . . tshol.*

165. Dp reads "toward the buddhas, his own teachers, and his father and mother" (*yu fo benshi ji fumu* 於佛本師及父母).

166. The following two verses (vv. 100–101) are cited at *Śikṣ* 54.17–55.2.

167. *Śikṣ* 54.18 reads *śikṣavrateṣu. Pāda* c *(śikṣadhuteṣu na tasya 'dhimuktiḥ)* is not represented in Jg. For *pāda* d *(pāpamates tri-r-apāyamukhasya)* Dp renders 女人即是惡趣門 (Women are indeed the entrance to a miserable destiny), as if from *pāpamate stri-r-apāyamukhasya* (?).

168. *Pretagatīṣu* is missing from Dp.

169. MS: *parātimanyanatā.* Finot's emendation to *parāvamanyanatā* is unnecessary.

170. Dh's rendering of this item is bizarre: 菩薩行世間巧便 起賈作治生想 是為自縛. It would appear that Dh did not fully understand his Indic text here; I would very provisionally translate this as follows: "When bodhisattvas practice worldly skills, involving themselves in trade and producing thoughts about making a living, this is a fetter for them." Jg's rendering largely captures the gist: 於世俗定 其心樂著 不求究竟 是菩薩繫縛 (Focusing their thoughts on the secular and attached to pleasure, they do not seek the ultimate goal; this is a fetter for bodhisattvas). Dp translates differently yet: *yu shijian shi fangbian qu qiu* 於世間事方便趣求 (he seeks after worldly matters by means of stratagems).

171. Dh's rendering of this phrase is difficult to construe: *yi bu shou fa hui wei fangyi xing* 意不受法慧為放逸行 (his mind does not accept the wisdom of the Dharma, so he acts without restraint). Clearly Dh and his committee had difficulty parsing these Indic compounds.

172. Again, Dp departs dramatically from the extant Skt. here: *sanluan yong xin ru xing xiannan* 散亂用心如行嶮難 (mentally disordered, like one walking along a precipice?).

173. This is the end of what is included from chapter 1 in Dh's translation.

174. Finot reads *dṛṣṭiśatebhiḥ,* but the MS reads *dṛṣṭigatebhiḥ* (Tib. *ltar gyur*). On the word *dṛṣṭigata,* see *BHSD* 269.

175. Tib. reads *gñen pa* (relatives) here, which may make better sense in the context. Jg has nothing corresponding to *jñātra* in this verse; Dp agrees with Tib.

176. In place of *bhūmi-*, Dp reads *san shen* 三身 (three bodies).

177. Skt. has *āśrayu* (body) here, though Tib. seems to have had a different reading: *bsam pa rnam par sbyaṅs* (purified my intentions), suggesting a reading of *āśaya.* It is likely, however, that Jg understood *āśraya* in *pāda* b: *ku xing leishou qiu puti* 苦行羸瘦求菩提 (I became emaciated practicing austerities as I sought enlightenment). Dp's rendering of *pāda* b is confusing: *yuanli shengse xiang zhen kong* 遠離聲色想真空 (keeping aloof from the pleasures of the senses, he thinks [only] about emptiness). Note too here and in verse 167 how the desiccation of the Buddha's ascetic body is in sharp contrast to the description of his perfected body elsewhere in the text. These two visions of the Buddha's body are not in conflict. The Buddha is in effect declaring his former willingness to drain his imperfect physical body—literally, to dry up its "outflows"

(Skt. *āśrava*)—so as to generate the store of merit that will result in his glorifed form. See the discussion in Chapter 1, pp. 12–19.

178. *Saṃsṛtu* appears to be a hyperform of **saṃsitu* (< √*sraṃs*) (see Shackleton Bailey 1954, 81, which suggested *sraṃsitu*). See also *BHSD* 542 *(saṃsati),* where Edgerton notes a phrase nearly parallel to what occurs here in the *RP: na ca vīryata* (so read) *saṃsati* (*Mv* II, 232.14 and 18).

179. Tib. *de 'dra'o* (like this) for Skt. *eṣata* (sought) is difficult to make sense of.

180. Skt. reads *bodhi balāj* here, but I read with Tib. *byaṅ chub dam pa* (= *bodhivarā*); see Shackleton Bailey 1954, 81.

181. The following fifty-three verses recount various *jātaka* tales, most of which are well known in Buddhist art and literature. The tales alluded to here have been identified in Okada Mamiko 1991, together with references to their occurrence in other Buddhist literature; further references can also be found in Grey 2000. See Chapter 2 for an extended discussion of the role of these allusions within the *RP.*

182. Jg appears to have taken *kṣāntirato* as the bodhisattva's name: *shi zuo xianren ming renru* 時作仙人名忍辱 (at that time I became the sage called "Tolerance").

183. Jg appears to have known a different version of this story: 為王歌利截鼻耳血變為乳無恚恨 (As King Kali cut off my nose and ears, the blood changed to milk, but I was without anger).

184. Dp completely misunderstood *pāda* b here, taking *bharato* (supporting) as a proper name: *wo wei xianren poluoduo* 我為仙人婆囉多 (when I was the sage Bharata).

185. MS: *-hatena,* contra Finot's *-hatana.*

186. Jg specifies that eight tigers (mother plus seven cubs?) were saved by the bodhisattva. The version of the hungry tigress tale *(Vyāghrī-jātaka)* that is found in the *Suvarṇabhāsottama-sūtra* (ch. 18; Nobel 1937, 208) indicates five cubs, though, interestingly, Dharmakṣema's fifth-century translation of this text indicates seven (T 663, 16: 354b.2; Nobel 1937, 208, n. 18). Ārya-Śūra's *Jātakamālā* also contains this *jātaka* (ch. 1), but it does not specify the number of cubs saved. It may be that Jg or the redactors of his Indic manuscript knew a tradition similar or identical to the one represented in Dharmakṣema's translation. See Ohnuma 1998, 331–335, on the motif of the five cubs saved by the Bodhisattva as paralleling the "good group of five," the first group of disciples to receive the Buddha's Dharma and attain arhatship.

187. Dp seems not to have understood the epithet *mahāpuruṣa: wo xiceng wei saduo shi* 我昔曾為薩埵時 (when I was formerly Sattva?).

188. MS reads *-samudraṃ,* which Finot emended to *-samudraḥ.* The reading of the manuscript may reflect the occasional use in BHS of the past passive participle (here *śoṣitu*) with active meaning governing an accusative. See *BHSG* §34.15.

189. Jg inserts a verse at this point that is not represented in any other version: 還為海神所盜竊 我時勇猛抒大海 尋時得珠還閻浮 用濟貧苦諸群生 (In order to return what was stolen by the god of the sea, at that time I valiantly drained the ocean. I immediately obtained a pearl and returned with it to Jambudvīpa, using it to rescue sentient beings struck by poverty and hardship). This interpolation has the appearance of a gloss on the previous verse.

190. Jg explicitly refers to the king here as Śibi (*shi pi* 尸毗). The particular sacrifice made here does not accord with the narrative of the famous *Śibi-jātaka,* found, for example, in Pāli *Jātaka* no. 499, *Jātakamālā,* ch. 2, or *Cariyāpiṭaka* I.8, but it does accord with the story found in the *Xianyu jing* (Scripture on the Wise and the Fool). See the references for and discussion of this famous tale in Chapter 2.

191. Skt. reads *āpya bhiṣagbhir,* which de Jong (1967, 5) suggests may be a mistake for *agryabhiṣagbhir,* a reading that is confirmed by the Tib.: *sman pa mchog gis.* I have adopted this reading.

192. Dp's translation departs dramatically from the Skt.: 亦於過去捨王位 盡世行彼波羅蜜 復自化身為妙藥 捨己身命濟群品 (And in the past I abandoned my position as king, thoroughly practicing the perfections generation after generation. Furthermore, I transformed my body into a marvelous medicine, abandoning my own body and life to rescue the masses). On the theme of using the body as medicine, see Okada Mamiko 1993; Ohnuma 1997, 191–199, and 1998, esp. 343–344.

193. MS: *anapekṣya-d-asaṃga* (contra Finot's *-asaṃgha*). See Ensink 1952, 23, n. 122.

194. Dp appears not to have recognized the name Uttaptavīrya in this verse, taking it instead as an attribute of a king named *miao ya* 妙牙 (marvelously toothed). Thus Dp must have confused the bodhisattva's name in the previous verse (Sudaṃṣṭra) as belonging to this verse. In verse 121, the name given is *shizi wang* 師子王 (king of the lions).

195. Skt. reads *arthadhanaśriyo,* which does not make sense here. Hence, I have followed Tib. *nor daṅ dpal yaṅ sṅon chad ṅas btaṅ ṅo.*

196. On the motif of suicide by fire in the Indian Buddhist tradition, see Filliozat 1963.

197. Dp did not recognize Puṇyasama here as a proper name: *rushi suozuo fu wudeng* 如是所作福無等 (thus the merit that was produced was without equal). Moreover, Dp appears to have been unable to match the names of the protagonists in several of these *jātaka* allusions to their proper verses; the above-cited line, for example, occurs at the end of Dp's translation of v. 126 concerning Śubha. The fact that in most instances the hero is identified in the last *pāda* of the verse suggests that Dp was often unable to determine from his manuscript where one verse ended and the next began. Moreover, this pattern indicates that these narratives concerning the bodhisattva's former exertions were not familiar to Dp and his translation team.

198. I have read, contra Finot, with the MS: *kaṃcanamuktibhūṣitaṃ pravaraśrīmān.* This verse, like many in this section, is unmetrical.

199. Contra Finot (1901, 23, n. 3), the MS in fact reads *komalapadmapatrasukumārau.*

200. Puṇyaraśmi is the principal subject of the entire second chapter of this *sūtra.*

201. Either Jg has read this verse very differently or his Indic manuscript had a significant variant here: 又作商主名金色 時有如來號無垢 於彼佛前然十指 供養最勝兩足尊 (Furthermore, when I was the merchant Kāñcanavarṇa, there was at that time a Realized One named Vimalaśuddha. I burned my ten fingers off before this buddha to honor the Supreme of the Bipeds).

202. Jg has no mention of Keśava as a physician, referring to him only as the bodhisattva. He augments this *jātaka* allusion with an additional verse not found in any other version: 菩薩爾時生慈悲 化作死女言喪妻 漸漸教化彼狂婦 還令醒悟得本心 (At that time the bodhisattva generated compassion, magically transforming himself into the dead husband [rd. *fu* 夫 with variant] to speak to his mourning wife. Gradually converting his deranged wife, she returned to her senses and regained her original state of mind). I thank Paul Harrison for providing some clarification on this passage. See also Dresden 1955, 449, for reference to this verse.

203. This verse does not appear to be represented in Dp.

204. I understand Skt. *hitvā* as a MIA form of *hṛtvā* (Tib. *phyuṅ nas*). See de Jong 1967, 5.

205. Female rebirths of the Buddha are extremely rare in the literature; there are, for example, none to my knowledge in the Pāli *Jātaka*s. This tale has been translated from the *Samādhirāja-sūtra* in Weller 1973 and is discussed in Okada Mamiko 1993 and Durt 1998.

206. Edgerton (*BHSD* 456–457) proposed reading *sā rūpāvatī* (contra Ensink's [1952, 25] Sārūpyavatī). Since the name Rūpyavatī is known from other *jātaka* sources (e.g., Hahn 1992, 51–57), I have read *sā rūpyāvatī* here (so MS), a reading that appears to be confirmed by Jg's *yinse* 銀色 (having the color of silver). This *jātaka* narrative has recently received careful study in Ohnuma 1997, 226–257, and 2000b.

207. Curiously, Jg takes *kanakābha-* (like gold) as the name of a city: *jinse cheng zhong* 金色城中.

208. Jg reads *zhanfu* 戰夫 (soldier), as if from *yodha* (soldier, warrior) instead of *godhā* (lizard). This alternation is difficult to make sense of on the basis of either a phonological or a graphic confusion. Dp has no mention of a lizard; his translation of this verse once again displays no cognizance of the narrative allusion.

209. Skt. reads *vṛddhaguruṃ jagatsmaritvā,* but I follow Tib. here: *glaṅ po bla ma rgan dran.* It seems that *jagat* may be an instance of metathesis for *gajaṃ* (see Shackleton Bailey 1954, 81). Although *vṛddhaguruṃ* could refer to either parent, this story is known from other sources to refer to the young elephant's (i.e., the bodhisattva's) mother. See *Mv* III, 129–133, and *Xiyuji* (T 2087, 51: 919a.7–19).

210. I follow de Jong (1967, 5) in reading *pramukto* here instead of *prayukto* (Tib. *btaṅ byas*).

211. I read *pāda* c *(saha darśanena samito 'gniṃ)* with Tib.: *mthoṅ ba tsam gyis me ni źi gyur nas,* which suggests an emendation to *śamito 'gnir* (see Shackleton Bailey 1954, 81).

212. This verse is missing from Dp.

213. Dp read *prāṇaku saumya* as *jusumo* 俱蘇摩, as if from *kusaumya. Prāṇaku* here means "animal" (see *BHSD* 391), but in some versions of this story, the animal in question is a large snake (see, for example, *Xiyuji,* T 2087, 51: 883a.23–26). See also Okada Mamiko 1991, 592.

214. Jg refers instead to a king named *juye* 居邪 (dwelling in perversion). I have no explanation for this.

215. Finot reads *kṣudhārtas* (afflicted with hunger) though the MS clearly has *kṣudhāttas.*

216. Jg reads *pāda*s b and c in unexpected ways: 遂教獼猴竹筒飲 獼猴悉免諸龍難 (Subsequently I taught the monkeys to drink from a bamboo tube, and the monkeys all escaped the difficulties with the *nāga*s). Dp has no mention of the monkeys' encounter with the *nāga*s.

217. I read *pāda* d as follows: *nāśayate 'pi ca pakṣi 'mu śasyam* (not as Finot: *muśasyam* or, with his proposed correction, *masasyam*). Tib. reads *lo tog smin 'di ma ruṅ byar sems sam; 'di* here confirms the reading *'mu* (this), but the *smin* appears to take *pakṣi* (bird) as a form of the verb √*pac* (to mature, ripen).

218. I read *kṛpārthatu* with La Vallée Poussin (1903, 311).

219. MS: *sarvajasya;* Finot emended to *sarvajanasya.* I read *sarvajagasya* with Tib. *('gro ba kun la).* See Shackleton Bailey 1954, 81.

220. Tib. *dka' ba brgya* suggests *duṣkaraśatāni* in place of Skt. *duṣkarakṛtāni* (see Shackleton Bailey 1954, 81). I have followed the Tib.

221. On the motif of internal and external gifts, see Ohnuma 2000a, 45, n. 11.

222. Jg's translation of *pāda*s a and b is rather different: 為求佛說大小乘 教示眾生令入道 (Because I sought buddhahood, teaching the great and small vehicles, [I now] teach sentient beings and cause them to enter the path).

223. *Pāda* c of the Skt. is defective: *śrutvā ca teṣam imāścaryam* (MS: *imaścaryāṃ*). I read *ima caryām* (Tib. *spyod pa 'di*), though this does not solve the metrical shortcomings.

224. There is some confusion, perhaps an eye skip, in Jg's translation at this point. He appears to have interchanged *pāda* d of v. 169 and *pāda* a of v. 170, which, of course, has drastically affected the intended sense of both verses.

225. Finot reads *śatakāṅkṣāḥ* here though the MS reads *-dhvāṅkṣāḥ* (lit. "crows"). Ensink (1952, 28) proposed *śaṭhadhvāṅkṣāḥ* in light of Tib. *khva ltar g.yo ṅan 'gyur.* I have adopted this reading. Other Mahāyāna texts refer to false *śramaṇa*s as being garrulous like crows; see *RR* I.4 (20) and II.5 (3).

226. Jg has "robes and food" (*yi shi* 衣食). Dp has "covetous of debauched pleasures and wealth" (*tanzhuo shengse ji caili* 貪著聲色及財利).

227. Such charges are frequently leveled in Mahāyāna *sūtra*s against those who rejected the authenticity of their texts (e.g., *RR* VII.25 and *KP* 5–6). See the discussion in Chapter 4, pp. 72–73.

228. Interestingly, Dp, in an apparent effort to blunt the rather unsettling claims made in this and the subsequent verse, begins his translation of v. 172 as follows: *wo wen guoqu you yi ren* 我聞過去有一人 (I heard that in the past there was a man).

229. Finot reads *śāmitaguṇaughaḥ,* but MS reads *cāmita-* (cf. Tib. *dpag med yon tan*).

230. Verses 172–173 represent a startling interpolation on the part of an editor into the body of the *RP;* for a discussion of its implications, see Chapter 4, p. 72. Thus v. 174 picks up from the charge leveled at the end of v. 171.

231. Dp's rendering of *pāda*s a and b is almost comically off the mark: "If there is

no 'sentient being,' no 'self' or 'person,' one's father, mother, and ancestors would not exist either" (既無眾生無我人 父母宗親亦不有).

232. *Pāda* d is slightly different in the Tib.: *dge sloṅ 'khor gyi naṅ du rgyal ba ni tshig 'di gsuṅ bar nam yaṅ mi 'gyur ro* (The Victor would never speak these words in the monastic assembly).

233. *Pāda* a reads differently in Skt. and Tib. First, we must read with the MS and against Finot: *hrīr apatrāpyaśīlarahitāś ca.* Tib. replaces -*śīla*- here with '*dzem,* which may reflect an original *lajjā* (modesty).

234. Skt. *kāṣāyakaṇṭha.* The term "ochre neck" is known already in Pāli sources *(kāsāvakaṇṭha)* as a sign of degeneracy in the *saṅgha.* At *Dhammapada* 307 we find: *kāsāvakaṇṭhā bahavo pāpadhammā asaññatā / pāpā pāpehi kammehi nirayaṃ te upapajjare //* (There are many with ochre necks, who are of evil character and lack self-control. These evil ones are reborn in hell on account of their evil deeds). This verse also occurs at *Vinaya piṭaka* III, 90.25-26, and at *Itivuttaka* 43.3-6. In the *Dakkhiṇāvibhaṅgasutta* of the *MN* (no. 142), one finds a discussion of the benefits that accrue to one who has made gifts to a variety of worthy persons. Not surprisingly then, the issue of gifts to unworthy persons must also be dealt with: *bhavissanti kho pan'Ānanda anāgatam addhānaṃ gotrabhuno kāsāvakaṇṭhā dussīlā pāpadhammā. tesu dussīlesu saṃghaṃ uddisa dānaṃ dassanti. tadā p'ahaṃ Ānanda saṃghagataṃ dakkhiṇaṃ asaṃkeyyaṃ appameyyaṃ vadāmi* (*MN* III, 256.6-10). I render this as follows: "There will be, Ānanda, at a future time, destroyers of the lineage with ochre necks, who are immoral and of evil character. [People] will give gifts to these immoral [monks] on behalf of the *saṅgha.* Even then, Ānanda, I say that a gift directed toward the *saṅgha* is incalculable and immeasurable [in merit]" (On the term *gotrabhū,* I follow von Hinüber 1978 [= 1994] in understanding the etymology as derived from **gotrahan* > **gotrahu* > *gotrabhū;* no other reading makes sense to me in this context. See also the discussion in Ruegg 1974 and 1981, de Wijesekera 1979, and Takasaki 1992). The Pāli commentaries explain *kāsāvakaṇṭha* as a yellow cloth wrapped around the neck, being the last of the outward signs remaining for one who is a monk in name only (von Hinüber 1994, 92-93). Note that the point of this passage is that the merit deriving from a gift to monks is not affected by their moral worthiness, a view not always shared by authors of Mahāyāna *sūtra*s. Jg does not appear to have understood this metaphor, offering a rather different interpretation of *pāda*s b and c: 袈裟恆常垂兩角 身被法服常在村 (They always let their ochre robes down at two corners; their bodies are draped with dharma-robes whenever they're in town). Dp is also different: 三衣不整垂手行 拖拽袈裟入聚落 (Their three robes are in disarray, hanging down past their hands as they walk. They drag their ochre robes as they enter a village).

235. The "banner" of the Buddha is a recurring metaphor in Mahāyāna literature for the monastic robe. In the *UP* (Stog, vol. 39 (Ca), 23a.1-b.2; Nattier 2003, 262-263), for example, there is an extended discussion enjoining lay people to respect a monk who has fallen from the conduct of a *śramaṇa* because even such a monk wears the ochre robe of the Buddha. At *RR* I.6-9 there is a sharp objection to monks wearing the "banner" of the Noble Ones but not possessing the virtues of a true *śramaṇa;* see also Silk 1994, 69-84.

236. Jg fleshes out the implications of *pāda* c: *yao wei suren tongxin shi* 樂為俗人通信使 (they take pleasure in acting as postal messengers for the laity). Note the criticism here that monks have abandoned their detachment from secular concerns by acting as go-betweens for the laity.

237. I read *pāda* a with the MS: *gohayagardabhāś ca paśudā[sa] saṃbhavate* (cf. Tib.: *de dag ba laṅ rta daṅ boṅ bu daṅ de dag phyugs daṅ bran pho bran mo srel*). There is some controversy among Indologists as to whether *dāsa* and *dāsī* refer to servants or to slaves, that is, to hired or to forced laborers. For an example of just how complex such distinctions became in Buddhist monastic discourse, see Schopen 1994b. For a bibliography on ancient Indian slavery more generally, see Silk 1992.

238. Jg renders *naiṣām anāryam api* as *yi bu qinjin shanzhishi* 亦不親近善知識 (And they do not cleave to virtuous friends).

239. The distribution of property was a central concern to the residents of large, settled monasteries of the first half of the first millennium C.E. Other Mahāyāna texts were also concerned with what they saw to be a preoccupation with and misdistribution of communal property (e.g., *RR* IV.10–13 and 18–20). See the discussion in Chapter 4.

240. Beginning with this verse through v. 200, Jg has not maintained a consistent metrical pattern in his translation. Verses in this section are rendered with as few as two and as many as seven seven-character units. It would appear then that Jg could not always discern where one verse ended and the next began. This has made it difficult to follow his translation in places.

241. MS: *prātana.* I read *pātana* with Finot (1901, 29, n. 6).

242. MS has *adantāḥ* for *adāntāḥ.*

243. MS reads *parivṛtā* contra Finot's *parivṛto.*

244. Finot reads *cala sidhya,* but the MS in fact has *ca lasiṣy[e],* which I take to be a mistake for *ca labhiṣye* (see Shackleton Bailey 1954, 81). I take *jane* in *pāda* d as a locative form for the ablative case (cf. Tib. *'gro las*); see *BHSG* §7.82.

245. Finot emends *nara teṣu* to *narakeṣu,* but the reading of the MS is preferable.

246. The monastic disciplinary canons regularly forbid the entrance into the order of any individual considered "undesirable," including, but not restricted to, deserters from the military, eunuchs, debtors, and those suffering from various deformities or diseases. For one such set of restrictions, see *Vinaya piṭaka,* I: 85–91 (trans. in Horner 1951, 108–116). Here, as elsewhere, the authors of the *RP* have taken a decidedly conservative position with regard to monastic recruitment.

247. Jg renders *uddeśasaṃvara-* as *jie wen ding hui* 戒聞定慧 (morality, learning, concentration, and wisdom).

248. Skt. *prapatitānāṃ;* I read with Tib. *(rab gduṅs)* and assume that the original text must have had something like *pratapitānāṃ* (see Shackleton Bailey 1954, 81).

249. I follow Shackleton Bailey (1954, 81) in reading *navakarmiko* for *na ca karmiko* in *pāda* a in light of Tib. *lag gi bla* (contra *BHSD* 171, which cites this passage). The *navakarmika* appears to have been a low-ranking monk, perhaps young and newly ordained, who performed manual labor for the monastery; see *BHSD* 291.

250. MS reads *nirbhatsitāpi* for *nirbhartsitāpi;* see *BHSD* 302.

251. Finot reads *pāda* c as *vacanaṃ na caite mama hi smṛtvā,* but clearly the MS reads *vacanaṃ nu caite. . . .* The negative particle is impossible here; Tib. confirms this reading.

252. Skt. *carimakāle.* On the concern for the decline and disappearance of the Dharma in Buddhist literature, see Nattier 1991. See also Chapter 4 for a discussion of Nattier's thesis vis-à-vis the *RP.* Jg has no mention of a final or last period in this verse or in v. 203. Dp alternates the terms *moshi* 末時 (final period) and *mofa* 末法 (final Dharma) throughout this section.

253. Finot reads *nāśam upekṣya,* but the MS has *upeṣya* here, which is to be preferred (cf. Tib. *'jig par 'gyur*).

254. Tib. understands this line differently: "They always show honor to those who are divisive, treacherous, fond of contention, and devoid of virtue" (*'byed daṅ zur zer* [= *gzuṅ gzer,* see *Mahāvyutpatti* 5587] *thab mo dga' ba daṅ yon tan ñams la rtag tu bsti staṅ byed*).

255. *Yūpaṃ* [so MS] *vararatnamayaṃ* is rendered by Jg as *bao yu* 寶輿 (jeweled chariot).

256. I read *sughore* with the MS.

257. Tib. *(dge sloṅ dul ba ma yin de 'dra ba)* confirms the MS reading *(etādṛśāś . . . ta cāpi bhikṣava adāntā)* against Finot's emendation.

258. Although the MS clearly reads *saṃgatiḥ* here, I have understood *sadgatiḥ* in light of the Tib. *(bzaṅ 'gro).* See also de Jong 1953, 548, and Shackleton Bailey 1954, 81. Edgerton (*BHSD* 547) cites the form *saṃgatiḥ* at *RP* 35.14, but there again, the proper understanding is almost certainly *sadgatiḥ* (again represented by Tib. *bzaṅ 'gro*).

259. *Preta* realm is not mentioned by Jg.

260. Note that Jg reads *śocyaḥ* (deplorable, miserable) as "impure" (*bujing* 不淨), as if from *aśuciḥ* or *aśaucaḥ.*

261. Skt. *kṣuttṛṣṇayena.* I accept Shackleton Bailey's (1954, 81) reading of *kṣuttṛṣṇabhayena,* which fills out the necessary number of syllables for the meter (though still without scanning properly) and corresponds with the Tib. *(bkres daṅ skom pa'i 'jigs pas).*

262. I follow de Jong (1953, 548) in reading *sūrata* (Tib. *des pa rnams*) in place of *dūra.* Jg's *diaofu* 調伏 confirms this reading.

263. As usual, Jg and Dp have taken *jñātra-* as "relatives" (*juanshu* 眷屬).

264. In place of Finot's *hi duram,* I read the MS as *bhiduram* (Tib. *'jig par 'gyur*); see also de Jong 1953, 548, and Shackleton Bailey 1954, 81.

265. I take *udyujyatā* (so MS) as a second-person-plural imperative here; cf. Tib. *rab tu sbyor źiṅ 'bad par gyis.*

266. Only the Skt. and Tib. indicate a chapter break here. None of the Chin. translations mark this transition.

Two: The Story of Puṇyaraśmi

1. Dh adds *hou dang lai shi* 後當來世 (in past, present, and future times); Jg adds *yu weilai shi* 於未來世 (in the future).

2. Contra Finot's *adhyavasāne bahulāḥ,* I read the MS as *adhyavasānabahulāḥ.*

3. Skt. *dhvāṅkṣā,* lit. "having the nature of crows"; the Tib. connects this term with the following *mukharāḥ: bya khva ltar mu cor smra ba* (who talk nonsense like a raven). See also "Prologue," n. 225. Dh renders as *huai xie* 懷邪 (harbor wickedness).

4. Dh takes *jñātragurukāḥ* here as a *dvandva* compound: 欺諸尊長及諸家室 (deceive gurus and relatives). Similarly Dp interprets it as follows: 虛誑父母及自師長 (they deceive their mothers and fathers as well as their own teachers).

5. Dh's rendering actually suggests the opposite of the Skt.: 用供養故還相誹謗 (they slander each other for the sake of homage). The clause is missing in Dp.

6. The Skt. appears to be corrupt here: *te ajñānino jñānanimittātmānaṃ pratijñāsyanti.* The Tib. makes the intended sense quite clear: *de dag mi śes bzhin du . . . bdag śes pa daṅ ldan par khas 'che bar 'gyur.* See de Jong 1967, 5.

7. I read with Ensink (1952, 32, n. 172): *kuśīdā jñānānavakalpanabahulāḥ.*

8. Dh has gone rather far astray here: 還相壞法別離眾會 (they jointly destroy the Dharma and leave the assembly). It would appear that Dh confused *-saṃgāyanatayā* with some form of *saṃgha* √*yā* (to flee the assembly), in all probability through a confusion of the aspirated and unaspirated velar stops (g/gh), which are often interchanged in *kharoṣṭhī* documents. See Chapter 5 for more details on the translation procedures that would have made such confusions possible.

9. Skt. *ayuktaparibhāṣājanasaṃjñaptyā* [so MS] *iha śāsane cariṣyanty;* the Tib. has something rather different: *rigs pa ma yin pa'i 'khor gyi skye bo daṅ bgro ba byed pas bstan pa 'di la spyod par 'gyur* (they will practice the teaching here by making deliberations with inappropriate company). It would appear that the Tib. read the first compound as *ayuktaparijana-*, either through an eye skip or alternative recension. Dh's *wei ta wu xing* 謂他無行 (they call others "undisciplined") in part confirms the reading of the Tib., apparently interpreting the compound as *ayukta-parajana.* However, Dh's immediately following *wo cheng fajiao* 我承法教 (I will carry on the teaching of the Dharma) suggests that he or his committee read *iha śāsane cariṣyanty* as *aha(ṃ) śāsane cariṣyāṃ(ī)ty.* Jg reads quite differently here: 所畜眷屬亦學是師以自圍遶 在我法中如是行者凡所作事 (The disciples they have trained also imitate their teachers by surrounding themselves [with disciples]. This is what those who thus practice in my Dharma generally do). Although the correspondence with the Skt. is not entirely clear, Dp also appears to be different: 聽信邪言 虛妄推度 是法說非 非法說是 (they believe in erroneous words, falsely inferring the teaching of the correct Dharma to be wrong and the teaching of the wrong Dharma to be correct).

10. Dh's *bu feng jinjie* 不奉禁戒 (do not comply with the precepts) for *aparipṛcchanaśīlāḥ* (contra MS: *āpari-*) is a good example of a reflexive translation common to Dh's works. Here Dh or a member of his translation committee selected the technical, specifically Buddhist, meanings of the locution *-śīlāḥ* rather than the more appropriate sense for this context.

11. Skt. *te daridrakule pravrajitāḥ samānā.* Is this an instance of the locative used for ablative (see *BHSG* §7.82), or should the MS be emended to *-kulebhyaḥ*? Cf. Tib. *de dag dbul po'i khyim nas rab tu byuṅ nas.*

12. On the nature of a possible confusion in Dh's rendering here, see Chapter 6, n. 9. Jg reads: 於我教中得少利養 (they will obtain little profit in my teaching).

13. For *ricitvā* here I accept Edgerton's reading (*BHSG* 227) of *riñcitvā* (cf. *KP* 90.3); Tib. *bor nas.* Dh's *xing fo gongde* 行佛功德 (practice the virtues of the Buddha) conveys the opposite of the intended sense.

14. On *śravaṇā* = *śramaṇā,* see "Prologue," n. 147. Tib. *dge sbyoṅ;* Jg: 自言我是沙門也 (they say of themselves: "We are *śramaṇa*").

15. Skt. *anulomikām api kṣāntiṃ.* For an extended note on the various forms of tolerance *(kṣānti)* enumerated in Mahāyāna *sūtra* literature, see Lamotte [1965] 1998, 143–145, n. 119.

16. Tib. identifies this as threefold *(ṅan soṅ gsum)* as does Jg (*san e dao* 三惡道). Dp renders as "to receive birth among the *mleccha*" (蔑戾車處於彼受生). The order of these eight in Dh's translation differs from the Skt.

17. I accept Shackleton Bailey's emendation here of Finot's *bahumānyatā* (MS: *bahulānyatā*) to *bahumāndyatā* (Shackleton Bailey 1954, 81); cf. Tib. *nad maṅ ba* and Jg *duo zhu binghuan* 多諸病患 (have many maladies).

18. I read with Ensink (1952, 33. n. 175) *viṣamāparihāreṇa* as one word (lit. "without escaping distress," contra Ensink's "through dangerous carelessness"). To this list Jg adds (as his fifth item): *yu chi wu chi* 愚癡無智 (they will be foolish, without wisdom). Dp adds, also as his fifth item: 具足蓋纏 身心憂慼 (fraught with obstacles and fetters, their bodies and minds are troubled).

19. Dh's *bu jian* 不見 (does not see) is likely to stem from a confusion between *pary√iṣ* (to seek) and *pary√ikṣ* (to see, observe).

20. Dh's *fo dingyi* 佛定意 (concentration on the Buddha) likely reflects a confusion between *buddha-samavadhānaṃ* and *buddha-samādhānaṃ,* perhaps through eye skip or a corruption in his manuscript. Dp has a rather unexpected rendering: 我不說謗佛有過失法 (I do not speak of defaming the Buddha as having a flawed Dharma [?] . . .).

21. Skt. reads *akalpitāryapathasya,* but I read *kalpita-* in light of Tib. *spyod lam bcos ma can la.*

22. I read *nāgauravasya* with Ensink 1952, 33, n. 176; cf. Tib. *ma gus pa la.*

23. I read *dharma<ga>veṣṭiṃ* with Shackleton Bailey 1954, 80 (contra Ensink, who proposed to read this as an instance of hiatus bridging: *dharma-v-eṣṭiṃ*). Edgerton's reading as *dharmaveṣṭiṃ* (*BHSD* 509) strikes me as less plausible. Tib. reads *chos yoṅs su tshol ba* (= *paryeṣṭiṃ?*).

24. The six heretical teachers refer to a group of rival schools during the Buddha's lifetime, the teachings of whom are listed, for example, in the *Sāmaññaphala-sutta* (*DN* I, 52–59). See also Renou and Filliozat [1953] 1996, 2: 514–515. There is no mention of the six heretical teachers in Dp; his translation of these last few lines is quite different.

25. Dh renders *asaṃyatā* as *wuzhi* 無智 (without knowledge). See Chapter 6 for a discussion of this translation anomaly.

26. Skt. reads *lābha-utsadā* (abounding in profit), but I read *lobha-utsadā* based on Tib. *chags śas che,* which fits the context better (though I should note that *chags* is also used for *lābha* elsewhere, as in vv. 2 and 7 below). Jg confirms neither reading: *tan*

mingyu 貪名譽 (covetous for reputation). Dp by contrast would seem to support the reading *lābha*-: 貪著於利養 (covetous for profit).

27. Skt. *saṃgatiḥ,* which I read as *sadgatiḥ* (Tib. *bzaṅ 'gro*). See "Prologue," n. 258.

28. For a possible explanation of Dh's seeming mistranslation of this verse, see Chapter 6.

29. Tib. reads *vastuṃ* as *gos* (= *vastraṃ*), "clothes."

30. The frequent reference to monks—*śrāvaka* and bodhisattva—sustaining ongoing relationships with their relatives reminds us that the going forth from the household as prescribed in the normative literature was not necessarily the sharp break from the family it is often depicted as. In this regard see esp. Schopen 1995b and 1996.

31. Dh's rendering departs rather dramatically from the Skt. text: 得神通智辯才具棄捐家室受所有 (obtaining the complement of supernormal powers, [special] knowledge, and eloquence, he relinquishes the household but holds onto what he has). Dh apparently has understood *vihāya* with *pāda* d instead of with *pāda* c and may have doubly translated the verb *gṛhṇāti* as both "hold onto" (*shou* 受) and "household" (*jiashi* 家室), as if from *gṛha.* On the phenomenon of double translations in Dh's works, see Boucher 1998, 489–493. Dp also departs significantly from the Skt.; he has, for example, no mention of relatives in either line.

32. Skt. reads *daurbalyam* (weak) here, but I read with the Tib. *mdog ṅan pa* (= *durvarṇam*), which is confirmed by Dh's *zai chou e zhong* 在醜惡中 (into an ugly condition), Jg's *e se* 惡色 (of bad appearance), and Dp's *choulou* 醜陋 (ugly).

33. This verse is cited at *Śikṣ* 153.2–5. On Dh's rendering of this verse, see Chapter 6.

34. Dh did not recognize Devadatta as a proper name: 假使於道無貪利 諸天人民悉得佛 (If on the path they are without desire for profit, gods and men would all obtain buddhahood). There is also no mention of Devadatta in Dp's translation.

35. MS reads *coddhurāḥ* (contra Finot's *boddharāḥ*); see Ensink 1952, 34, n. 180.

36. Jg reads quite differently: 若為菩提求佛法 何得不依解脫行 (If one seeks buddha qualities for the sake of enlightenment, how can one not depend upon the practice [which leads to] liberation).

37. *Lepa* is a sticky substance used as a snare to trap monkeys; see *BHSD* 463.

38. I follow K. R. Norman's interpretation of the locution *dharmapada;* see Norman [1997] 2000, 61.

39. Skt. *śāsanam,* but Tib. *(bstan las)* and context suggest *śāsanāt.*

40. On Dh's rendering of this verse, see Chapter 6.

41. Finot reads *pakāśanam,* but the MS clearly has *prakāśanam;* see Ensink 1952, 35, n. 185.

42. The length of a *yojana* varies in different sources; one *yojana* is usually said to be equivalent to nine or ten English miles. Dh calculates the length and breadth of Arciṣmat's kingdom as 640,000 tricents *(li),* with one *yojana* thus understood to equal forty *li* (approximately thirteen miles).

43. Note that none of the Chinese translations correctly understood the locution *aṣṭapada*-, which denotes a checkerboard-like pattern with which the concentric series of city walls was adorned with jewels.

44. -*niyutāni* is missing from Tib.

45. Skt. *te bhavitavyaṃ na karmakriyoddhareṇa.* Ensink (1952, 36, n. 187) is correct to note that the MS does in fact appear to read -*uddhureṇa* here, but I have read with Finot and Edgerton (*BHSD* 130) in light of the probable intended sense.

46. *dāna*- is not represented in Tib.; -*saṃyama*- is not represented in Jg.

47. *bāndhavā* is not represented in Tib.

48. I follow Ensink (1952, 36, n. 192) in reading *patamāna* in place of Finot's *yatamāna* (*pa* and *ya* are almost indistinguishable in the Nepalese MS). Tib. confirms this reading: *ltuṅ ba'i tshe na.*

49. Jg appears to be missing *pāda* d here and has instead substituted *pāda* a of v. 24: 勤事善知識 (diligently serving good friends). *Pāda* d of v. 24 in Jg is in turn *pāda* a of v. 25 in the Skt. The same appears to be true of Dp.

50. Tib. renders the second line somewhat differently: *rdo rje lta bu sñiṅ gi bsam gtan par / saṅs rgyas lam 'di ñid la gnas par gyis //* (Adhere to this very buddha path and meditate with an adamantine heart). My translation of the Skt. follows the Tib. in reading a probable *saṃśraya (gnas par gyis)* instead of *suśrutam* at the end of *pāda* d (see de Jong 1967, 6). However, Jg's *zhengwen* 正問 may confirm the Skt. *suśrutam.* It is not clear if Dp has anything corresponding to this verse at all. His translation of the final verses of this section is greatly collapsed and confused.

51. This clause, which is only implicit in the Skt., is stated explicitly in the Tib.: *tshol ba'i tshe na.*

52. This last *pāda* is not represented in Tib. and Jg. The entire verse appears to be missing in Dp.

53. Dh has 從是已 [var. 彼以] 來具足萬歲之中 (ever since then, during a full 10,000 years). Clearly Dh assumes the text to have been talking about the many previous lives of Puṇyaraśmi, although it is not clear how he might have arrived at this reading.

54. Dh's reading is most unexpected here: 未曾貪身亦不念歌舞伎樂 (he never coveted his body and did not think about song, dance, or instrumental music). Part of the confusion here might be explained if we hypothesize that Dh read *sakhāyān* (friends) as *sa kāyÆn* (his body), perhaps from an interchange of *k* and *kh* in a *kharoṣṭhī* manuscript. Furthermore, his *nian* 念 would seem to respond to Skt. *vismitaḥ,* read perhaps as *vi* [= '*pi*] *smitaḥ* [= *smṛtiḥ*].

55. Contra Finot's *sarvavasuṣu,* the MS reads *sarvavastuṣu* here.

56. *paramadaurbalyabhāvaṃ* appears to be omitted from Tib.

57. Dh's 天下恩愛 (the affections of the world) appears to respond to *lokam anāsvasan* (so MS), but seemingly read as if *loka-manÆs*-.

58. Dh's rendering of *bālollāpanaṃ* is curious: 以愚癡力常喜諍 鬥 (by the power of fools, they always take pleasure in contention). There are at least two problems here. First, we seem to have another instance of double translation, with a rendering for both *bāla* (fools) and *bala* (strength, power). Second, Dh has understood *ullāpana* as "contention," a meaning it can have (see *BHSD* 148: "shouting or yelling derisively, abusive derision"), but not in this context. It is also possible that Dh has rendered *viruddhaṃ* (hostile, adverse) here, which is connected with *pṛthagjanatvaṃ* in the

Skt. In short, Dh has ordered the phrases of this section quite differently and, in some cases, incoherently.

59. Skt. appears to be corrupt in this line: *vimoghadharmaṃ bhavābhiṣṭaṃ śamatṛptaṃ.* Edgerton (*BHSD* 497) suggests that *vimogha-* may be a hyper-Sanskritization for *vimoha-* (delusion). However, the MS clearly reads *vimoṣa-*, and I have translated accordingly. For the remainder of the phrase, I have followed the Tib.: *srid pa la mṅon par dga' bas chog mi śes pa.* It is not clear to me what Indic original underlay Dh's *luan fa* 亂法 (violate the Dharma).

60. *Pṛthagjana* refers to a person who has not received the teaching of the Dharma and thus has made no progress toward enlightenment. This category is contrasted with the *āryaśrāvaka,* the spiritually ennobled disciple, who has at least started along the path toward arhatship. On this spiritual division of the Buddhist world, especially in Pāli sources, see Masefield 1986, 1–36.

61. Dh's *yao shi cai* 樂施財 (takes pleasure in giving wealth) suggests an underlying *Rati-pradāna, reflecting another confusion between aspirated and unaspirated consonants common to *kharoṣṭhī* documents or, perhaps, a distinction unrecognized during the oral/aural translation process (on which see Chapter 5).

62. The following account of King Arciṣmat and his glorious city appears intended to parallel a tale like that found, for example, in the "History of Dīpaṃkara" in the *Mahāvastu* (Senart [1882–1897] 1: 193–231; translated in Jones 1949–1956, 1: 152–187). It goes without saying that the authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* did not necessarily co-opt this legend from the *Mahāvastu* specifically.

63. Tib. reads one thousand; Jg reads 84,000.

64. In place of Skt. *yaṣṭīratna-* (so MS), I read *ṣaṣṭiratna-* with Tib. *(drug khris);* see Ensink 1952, 37, n. 196.

65. The interpretation of this clause is not entirely clear, as evidenced by the variety of translations among our sources. Tib. reads *rin po che'i skud pa thams cad kyaṅ phyogs bźi nas // śiṅ ta la'i phreṅ ba bye bas sbrel to* (And every jeweled thread in the four directions *[sic]* is fastened with millions of rows of palm trees). In place of Skt. *caturdaśa-* Tib. appears to have read *caturdiśa- (phyogs bzhi nas),* "in the four directions," which makes little sense in the context. The reading of the Skt. is confirmed by all three Chin. translations. Jg appears to agree with Tib. in the interpretation of *-tālapaṅkti-*: 諸寶繩間懸十四俱致寶多羅樹 (On every jeweled cord hangs fourteen *koṭi*s of jeweled palm trees). Dp by contrast takes *tāla* as a musical instrument: 一一寶索有十四俱胝樂器 (Every jeweled thread has fourteen *koṭi*s of musical instruments). Dh's rendering is the least clear: 一切諸寶繩各有千四百億帶係 (Each jeweled cord has 1,400 *koṭi*s of hanging strings [?]). Parallel phrasing occurs below, 40.18–21.

66. For *apanāyaṃ* I read *amanāpaṃ* with the MS (Tib. *yid du mi 'oṅ ba*).

67. Skt. appears to be corrupt here: *aśvaśo dhanaṃ,* which is in all probability a mistake for *aśvagodhanaṃ* (*śa* and *ga* are graphically similar in this Nepalese MS). Tib. partially confirms this reading, but with a slight variant: *rta daṅ śiṅ rta daṅ ba laṅ daṅ nor* (horses, carriages, cattle, and wealth); see also Shackleton Bailey 1954, 81.

68. Jg understood *toraṇa* here quite differently: 於其城上起大高樓眾寶莊嚴 (On top of the city wall he had set up tall towers adorned with manifold jewels).

69. Dh reads *aṣṭottaraṃ ca siṃhamukhaśataṃ* as 八百師子之頭 ("eight hundred lions' heads"). Dh often renders *aṣṭaśata* ("108") in his translations generally as "800," indicating that he was not cognizant of the special significance of the former quantity in Indian religious thought.

70. Jg has read this description differently, perhaps on the basis of a variant tradition: 於一方面有二師子百寶所成 彼二師子各吐香水入彼池內 其池四邊復各有二寶師子各各引水而出其池 (On each side [of the pond] there are two lions made of hundreds of jewels. These two lions both emit scented water into this pond. On the four sides of this pond there are also two jeweled lions, both of which draw water out of the pond). Dp agrees with Skt.

71. Tib., Jg, and Dp read as eight hundred.

72. Dh's translation here is again unexpected: 各以八十八寶縷 [var. 繩] 轉相連結 (each was attached to one another by eighty-eight jeweled threads). It would appear that Dh misconstrued *ṣaṣṭi ṣaṣṭi* as *aṣṭāśīti,* though the phonological transmutations necessary for this understanding are not easy to explain.

73. Jg understood the palm trees here as "on the four sides of the pond" (*qi chi si mian* 其池四面) rather than as jeweled ornaments themselves fastened to jeweled trees. Cf. above, n. 65.

74. Tib. is missing the negative particle *(mā . . . nipatiṣyatīti)* that is necessary for this sentence: *gźon nu'i lus la sa daṅ rṅul gyis reg tu 'oṅ źes rdziṅ de'i steṅ rin po che'i dra bas bkab par gyur to.*

75. On the term *duṣya* (so MS), see Hoernle [1916] 1988, 138, n. 12.

76. Tib. reads eighty-seven *koṭis*.

77. The Skt. reads only *aśītisahasrapralambitaṃ,* but the Tib. includes mention of jeweled nets *(rin po che'i dra ba brgyad khri rab tu spyaṅs),* which is clearly implied by the Skt. See Ensink 1952, 39, n. 199.

78. Tib. numbers them at 9,900,000 *('bum phrag dgu bcu rtsa dgu).* Dh has 90,000. Dp agrees with Tib.

79. It seems likely that Jg read *yojana-prabhāṇi* as *yojana-pramāṇi:* 一一寶聚高一由旬 (each pile of jewels reached a *yojana* in height).

80. On the Nandana park in the Trayatriṃśa heaven, see *DPPN* 2, 21.

81. MS has only *sarvākārasampannāni,* while Tib. suggests *sarvākāra-rasa-saṃpannāni (ro'i rnam pa thams cad phun sum tshogs pa);* see de Jong 1967, 6.

82. In place of Skt. *vṛddhyaḥ,* I read with Tib. *yan lag 'jam pa,* which Shackleton Bailey (1954, 81) suggests may be equivalent to *mṛdvaṅgyaḥ.*

83. Skt. *pūrvābhilāpin,* lit. "speaking or greeting first." See *BHSD* 352. Jg renders as *yanyu tiaorou* 言語調柔 (their speech is agreeable).

84. I accept de Jong's emendation of *ekāntam anāmayacāriṇyaḥ* to *ekāntamanāpacāriṇyaḥ* (Tib. *śin tu yid du 'oṅ ba'i tshul daṅ ldan pa*); see de Jong 1967, 6.

85. Skt. has no mention of "executioner" *(vadhakaṃ),* though it is clearly implied

by the context and explicitly supplied by the Derge and Stog recensions of the Tib. *(gśed ma),* but not by Peking, London, and Narthang.

86. Jg took *pramadāṃ* (women) as *pramādāṃ,* "sexual desires" (*seyu* 色欲).

87. Dh reads "for one thousand years."

88. Dh has understood *pāda*s a and b quite differently: 願子且觀我諸寶 子初生時自然出 (May my son behold here my jewels. As soon as my son was born, they appeared spontaneously).

89. Dh's rendering has no mention of a city, even though the remaining parts of this verse are more or less present in his translation.

90. I read *adya* with Shackleton Bailey (1954, 81) in place of *anyaiś* (Tib. *de riṅ*).

91. I read *svarāṅgarucirāḥ* with MS.

92. On the Citraratha grove in the Trāyastriṃśa heaven, see *DPPN* 1, 870.

93. For *prathamaṃ hi vayas tavedaṃ,* Dh has 是第一自在智 (this is the supreme, self-existent knowledge). Although it is difficult to fathom how Dh arrived at this rendering on the basis of the extant Sanskrit, I should note that *zizai* 自在 in his translations is often used to represent Sanskrit *vaśa-, vaśī-, vaśitā* (control, mastery). This further suggests that Dh may have misread *vayas tavedaṃ* as *vaśata vedaṃ,* reflecting a not uncommon confusion between the graphically similar *ya* and *śa* in his reading of *kharoṣṭhī* texts. Having misread and improperly divided the words here, he then read *vedaṃ* (*zhi* 智, "knowledge") instead of *tava-idaṃ.*

94. Gandharva-mādana is presumably the same as the mountain range better known as Gandha-mādana, as Ensink (1952, 41, n. 206) asserts and as Edgerton (1953a, 209) speculates. See also the extensive description in *DPPN* 1, 746–748. Clearly Tib. understood it as such: *spos daṅ* [read: *ṅad*] *ldan,* as did Jg: 香山雪山無有異 (Fragrant Mountain and the Himālayas are identical). Dh, in typical fashion, seems not to have understood the proper name at all: 諸香白花 [var. 蓮] 譬如雪 (the fragrant white lotuses are like snow).

95. I read *varāstṛtāni* with MS, contra Finot's *varāsṛtāni* (Tib. *rab btiṅ ba*). See Ensink 1952, 41, n. 207.

96. Jg has no equivalent for *dānavisarās.*

97. On Dh's rendering of *apsarasāṃ* here as *yunü* 玉女 (jade maiden), see Chapter 5, p. 99.

98. Dh has rendered *pāda*s a and b here at the end of the previous verse.

99. There are an extra two *pāda*s in this verse, which the Tib. translators did not recognize. Hence the remaining verses of this section are no longer synchronized between the Skt. and Tib. The Tib. has read the extra *pāda*s at the end of the section. Jg has translated them here.

100. Dh has interpreted *saṃsārapañjaragataṃ jagad īkṣya* as 皆見於五道 生死諸人民 (seeing all the people in *saṃsāra,* amidst the five destinities . . .) as if from *saṃsāra-pañcagati.* If Dh was working from a *kharoṣṭhī* manuscript as I have speculated, it is entirely possible that *-pañjara-* could have occurred as *-pajara-*, thus coming close to *paja,* one of the Gāndhārī forms for *pañca* (Brough 1962, 129, v. 78). But note that below (v. 48) Dh understood *pañjaragataḥ* more or less correctly as *duo luowang* 墮羅網 (fallen in a net).

101. Skt. *chavimātrakarūpyaramyāḥ* (lit. "beautiful and pleasing only on the skin"). Tib. seems to have understood *-rūpa-*: *lpags pa'i gzugs kyis dga' ba tsam,* as perhaps did Jg: 如此婇女假外色 (like the false, external form of these women).

102. The Skt. appears to be corrupt here: *svapnāya mābhiratayo.* I have read with Tib. *dga' ba rmi lam 'dra ba,* which suggests an underlying *svapnopamābhiratayo* (*pa* and *ya* are graphically very similar in this MS).

103. For *tṛṣṇāpravṛttiniratah̥,* Tib. has *sred pa rab tu 'phel la dga' bas,* suggesting *tṛṣṇā-pravṛddhi-niratah̥;* see de Jong 1967, 6. Jg reads 恩愛增長求無厭 (affections increase, seeking after them without satiety), which also suggests that his Indic manuscript read *-pravṛddhi-*. I have retained the Skt. reading.

104. Finot read *pavanair aham aprakampyaḥ* here in place of the MS's reading: *pavanair iha aprakampyaḥ.* I have retained the MS reading, which the Tib. confirms: *'dir ni ji ltar lhun po rluṅ gis mi bskyod bźin.*

105. Verses 44 and 45 are reversed in Dh. These verses are badly mixed up in Dp, as is generally true of his rendering of this entire section.

106. I take *bhavatāṃ* as a 3rd sing. form used for 1st pl.; see *BHSG* §25.15.

107. For *kaṇḍitasya,* I read with Tib. *mkhas la* (= *paṇḍitasya*); see de Jong 1967, 6. Jg reads differently: 咄哉三界求王位 (Fie upon seeking kingship in the triple world).

108. These similes are something of a cliché in Buddhist literature; see the list of references in Lamotte [1976] 1994, 37–38, n. 28, and Silk 1994, 343, n. 2 (where he cites this passage from the *RP*).

109. Dh has translated *narendra kāyaḥ* as 何所是人尊 (who is this honored among men?), as if from *kÆ yaḥ,* an interrogative and relative pronoun. On *hesuo* as "who," see Zhu 1992, 207, and Karashima 1998, 176. Dh's rendering of this entire verse is quite problematic. Jg renders *narendra kāyaḥ* as 父王園林 (father-king, the grove). I have no explanation for this.

110. For *oghe 'tiruhyate,* I accept de Jong's (1967, 6) emendation: *ogebhir uhyati,* based on the Tib. *chu bo rnams kyis bdas na.*

111. Both Tib. and Jg take the subject of the verb (Skt. *saṃprekṣase*) as first person.

112. Jg appears to have understood *śivadharmanāva* as *iva-dharmanāva* (*ru fachuan* 如法船).

113. *mahāsahasre* is an abbreviation for *trisāhasra-mahāsāhasra-lokadhātau;* see Nakamura [1981] 1991, 923b.

114. Curiously, for *drakṣyanti yena tribhavaṃ naṭaraṅgakalpam,* Dh has 令諸三界人 得三忍平等 (cause people of the triple world to attain the equanimity of the three tolerances). I suspect that Dh's committee somehow understood *drakṣyanti* as *tri-kṣānti,* perhaps through aural confusions during the translation process. The source of his *pingdeng* 平等 is not at all evident. Jg also did not understand the simile here: 令見三界大火聚 (I will cause [sentient beings] to see the triple world as a great conflagration).

115. Skt. reads *meghaṃ,* but I read with Tib. *byams* (= *maitrī*). This reading appears to be confirmed by Dh's and Jg's *ci* 慈.

116. Jg understood *bodhyaṅgadhara-* as *bodhyaṅga-dhāraṇī-*: *daopin zongchi* 道品總持.

117. Finot reads *pāda* a as *anusrota sarvajagatī pratisrotā so'haṃ,* but the MS clearly has *anuśrota sarvajagatī pratiśrota 'mohaṃ* (= *imu-ahaṃ;* see *BHSG* §21.51). On the use of the demonstrative pronoun as an emphatic with the personal pronoun, see Renou [1961] 1984, 374–375.

118. Finot reads *meruprayātam api sāgaram utsaheyaṃ,* but I read the MS as *meruprapātam api . . .* (Tib. *lhun po'i rtse nas rgya mtsho'i naṅ du mchoṅ spro yi*). See also Ch'en 1954, 278, on this passage.

119. Contra Finot's *udvignamanāḥ saṃstribhir,* the MS has *udvignamanaḥsaṃstribhir,* which should probably be read as *-manasaṃs . . .* (nom. sing.?; see *BHSG* §16.6).

120. Skt. *sasaṃvegajāto.* On the significance of *saṃvega,* which often denotes an overwhelming emotional experience, see Coomaraswamy [1943] 1977 and Schopen 1989, 133, n. 2. Curiously, Dh understood the expression as "melancholic and unhappy" (*chouyou bu le* 愁憂不樂).

121. Contra Finot's *gacchetātrāntarikṣe* here, the MS reads *gacchethātrāntarikṣe.* Ensink (1952, 44, n. 226) emends to *gacchatha-* in order to fit the meter, but this *pāda* is irregular and not thereby restored. On *gacchetha* without causative meaning, see *BHSG* 210.

122. *Paracari* here can also mean "course for others," and the ambiguity here and again in v. 68 may well be intentional. For a similar double-entendre in the *Jātakamālā,* see Ohnuma 2005, 116.

123. Skt. *śunyo.* I read *sūryo* with Tib. *(ñi),* Dh (*ruo ri chu* 若日出), Jg (*deng jing ri* 等淨日), and Dp (*ru qian ri* 如千日); see Ensink 1952, 45, n. 229.

124. An equivalent for *nābhi* is missing from Tib., Dh, and Jg; thus all the adjectives of the second line refer to *ūrṇā* in those versions.

125. In place of *bhramaragaṇaviśuddhā,* Dh has 覺意為清淨 (his aspiration to enlightenment is pure). I have no explanation for this. Jg also has no mention of a multitude of bees here, but he does at this point describe the Buddha's ears as long. This is likely an instance, by no means isolated in this translation, of the translator interpolating information based upon his knowledge of other Buddhist texts.

126. Tib.'s *sems can lhan cig* here suggests that the translators read *saha sattvai* instead of *sahasraṃ vai* in the extant Skt. Shackleton Bailey (1954, 82) rejects both the Skt. and Tib. readings and suggests an emendation to *sa hasan vai.* I have not followed him in this.

127. The second line of this verse is placed at the end of v. 64 in Jg.

128. *brahmaghoṣa;* for *brahma-* as "best, superlative," see "Prologue," n. 21.

129. I understand *giri* here as "speech" not "mountain," contrary to Tib. *(ri)* and Ensink (1952, 45). Cf. the similar usage at *RP* 27.8: *tac ca giriṃ* [so MS] *vadato mama śrutvā.* See also *BHSD* 211.

130. The Narthang and Stog recensions of the Tib. read *sbyoṅ ba* here (Stog = *sbyoṅ bar*), suggesting an underlying *śodhanī* (purifying) instead of Skt. *bodhanī* (enlightening). Derge and Peking recensions read *spyod pa;* London reads *sbyor ba.* Dh has

qingjing 清淨 (pure) and Jg has *xin jing* 心淨 (of pure mind), also suggesting an underlying *śodhanī*. I have read accordingly.

131. MS reads *śānta-* here, while the Tib. reads *ston pa'i* (of the teacher), presumably for *śāstu* (see de Jong 1967, 7). I have translated with Tib.

132. Skt. *saptotsadāṅga;* the seven limbs with protuberances are the two hands, two feet, two shoulders, and back of the neck, together constituting one of the thirty-two major marks of a superhuman (see *BHSD* 126).

133. Dh has no mention of *nābhi* here as above (v. 62).

134. See Skilling 1996, 8, for the occurrence of these symbols on the palms of the Buddha's hand. The Tibetan translation of this passage, as Skilling notes (24, n. 19) places the swastikas and wheels on the soles of the Buddha's feet *(źabs mthil mdzes par bris pa bkra śis 'khor lo'i mtshan).*

135. On a translation anomaly in Dharmarakṣa's rendering of this verse, see Chapter 5, pp. 98–99.

136. Dh has introduced a series of similes for these terms that is not represented in any of the other versions: 踊躍歡喜 譬如貧窮飢凍之人得伏匿寶藏 其人歡喜 譬如盲人得眼目 若如牢獄繫囚得解脫 其人歡喜 王太子德光 聞嗟歎佛功德及法比丘僧 欣喜如是 ([Prince Puṇyaraśmi] jumped for joy and was pleased, like a poor, hungry, and cold person who obtained a hidden treasure of jewels—the pleasure of that person; like a blind person who obtained sight; like prisoners who obtained release—the pleasure of those people. When Prince Puṇyaraśmi heard the eulogy on the Buddha's virtues and on those of the Dharma and the *saṅgha* of monks, his joy was like this). This very well may have been a gloss Dh produced for the benefit of his translation assistants which was not distinguished from the translation by one or both parties. See Chapter 5 on the translation procedure that would have made this possible.

137. I read *viṣama-* with La Vallée Poussin (1903, 311) in place of *viṣaya-*; cf. Tib. *ya ṅa ba.*

138. For *anāsvādaṃ* I read *anāsvāsaṃ* with the MS. Cf. Tib. *dbugs 'byin pa med pa* (= *anāśvasam,* but the MS appears to preserve the dental sibilant here as elsewhere; cf. 39.12).

139. Tib. appears to have understood *niranuraktaṃ* as from *anu* √*rakṣ: rjes su mi sruṅ ba* (unguarded, without protection).

140. Tib., Dh, and Jg indicate that this was done three times.

141. Tib. reads *riṅ nas ldoṅs* (long-term blindness), as if from *cirāndhena* instead of Skt. *cirād adya* (see Shackleton Bailey 1954, 81). I read with Skt. None of the Chinese translations supports the reading of the Tibetan.

142. Dh's translation of this first line is most unusual: 吾不久睹醫王名 今者輒得見於佛 (I will before long understand the reputation of the King of Physicians. But today I can immediately see the Buddha"). While there is much that is not easy to explain in this rendering, Dh's team appears to have confused some form of *kṛcchra* (MIA *ki[c]cha*), "hardship, difficulty," with *kīrti* (MIA *ki[t]ti*), "fame, reputation." Neither a phonological nor an orthographic source for this confusion is obvious. The second line of this verse is equally bizarre.

143. Curiously, Dh has rendered *apramādo* here as *wuxiang* 無想 (without conceptualization), as if from *asaṃjñā*. I have no explanation for this.

144. For *devatātyaḥ,* I read the MS as *devatābhyaḥ* (already noted in La Vallée Poussin 1903, 312, n. 1).

145. Tib. appears to have understood *apramādaḥ* in place of Skt. *pramādaḥ* here *(mi rnams bag mchis 'gyur ba ji lta bu).* Jg agrees with Tib.: 云何不放逸 (Why are they not wanton?).

146. Jg has rendered *deśiko* as *shangzhu* 商主 (guild master). I have no explanation for this.

147. Dh has understood *tīrthaṃ* here as *wai dao* 外道 (heretics), as if from *tīrthika.*

148. On the form *uhyato,* a present middle participle with active ending, see *BHSG* §37.15.

149. Dh has rendered the name of this *dhāraṇī* as *wujin* 無盡 (inexhaustible), var. *wugai* 無蓋 (without surpass).

150. The following set of verses (81–112) is cited at *Śikṣ* 318.5–322.4.

151. *Śikṣ* 318.6 reads *-parā* in place of *-dharā.*

152. *Śikṣ* 318.7 reads *nakhā* (fingernails) in place of *jinā.*

153. *Śikṣ* 318.8 omits *-vare*, an omission that restores the meter. It is also omitted in the Tib.

154. Once again here, Dp has introduced a great-small vehicle rhetoric into the text in his translation: 應機流演大小乘 普救世間諸有苦 (Adapting to the circumstances by propagating the Great and Small Vehicles, he broadly rescues the world from its hardships).

155. *Śikṣ* 319.1 reads *-gato* instead of *-gateḥ,* but this is almost certainly a scribal error in *Śikṣ.*

156. Looking ahead a plow's length (approximately six feet) is a cliché for a renunciant whose gaze and bodily deportment are under control. Other canonical instances of this expression can be found at *Sutta-nipāta,* v. 410; *MN* II, 137; and *LV* 682.5.

157. *Śikṣ* 319.3 reads *-nibhā* instead of *tava.*

158. *Śikṣ* 319.3 reads *sūkṣma-* in place of *ślakṣṇa-*.

159. *Śikṣ* 319.6 reads *paramakāruṇikam* here in place of the vocative. Jg by contrast reads "supremely compassionate father" (*da bei fu* 大悲父) as does Dp (*da ci fu* 大慈父).

160. *Śikṣ* 319.7 reads *sudṛḍhaḥ* instead of *sudṛḍhaṃ.*

161. *Śikṣ* 319.12 reads *-ruto* in place of *-ravā.*

162. *Śikṣ* 319.16 reads *atikṛpālutayā* in place of *api kṛpālutayā.*

163. For *pāda* b *Śikṣ* 320.1 reads: *saṃbhrāmitaṃ satata vīkṣya jagat* (looking upon the world as always bewildered) in place of *saṃtāpitaṃ satataṃ īkṣya jagad.* Tib. reads *skrag pa gyur ba'i* for the past participle here, perhaps reflecting an underlying *saṃtrāsitaṃ* (frightened, terrified).

164. Finot reads *pāda* c as *vaidyottamo vicarase 'pratimaḥ,* but cf. Tib. *bla med sman pa lta bur,* which appears to correspond with *Śikṣ* 320.2 *(vaidyopamo vicarase 'pratimo).*

165. In place of *īkṣya, Śikṣ* 320.4 reads *avekṣya.*

166. Tib. omits any mention of "fortunate destinies."

167. *Śikṣ* 320.6 reads *mārgavaraṃ* in place of just *mārgam* of the MS; Tib. corresponds with *Śikṣ (lam gyi dam pa).* I have adopted this emendation, as the meter is defective without it.

168. Finot reads *akarṣaya,* which he takes as *ākarṣayan* (1901, 52, n. 2). The MS actually has *akakarṣaya,* but I follow Shackleton Bailey (1954, 81), who understands *akarkaśa,* which is supported by *Śikṣ* 320.9 and presumably Tib.'s *mñen.*

169. In place of *jina yānti, Śikṣ* 320.12 reads *janayanti.*

170. Tib. renders this as first person *(bdag 'gyur).*

171. So Skt. The more usual form of the name of this class of deities is *paranirmita,* as reflected at *Śikṣ* 321.2. The same form occurs in v. 107 below.

172. *Śikṣ* 321.2 reads *sa yāmapatiḥ.*

173. *Śikṣ* 321.4 reads *-haraṃ* instead of *-haraḥ.*

174. *Śikṣ* 321.4 reads *padaṃ ca paramaṃ virajaṃ* in place of *paraṃ padavaraṃ hy ajaram;* Tib. appears to support the latter reading *(gnas mchog rga śi med pa).*

175. I read *puṇyārthikasya* in place of *puṇyādhikasya* in light of *Śikṣ* 321.7 and Tib. *bsod nams don gñer ba'i.*

176. One could get the impression that the authors of the *Rāṣṭrapāla* here are making a not so subtle contrast between the inexhaustible *(akṣaya)* treasury *(nidhi)* of merit of the bodhisattva on the one hand and the donation of a permanent *(akṣaya)* endowment *(nīvī)* to settled monasteries, recorded in inscriptions from the turn of the Common Era, on the other. On the latter institution, see Schopen 1994a, 532–535. Issues related to this sort of implied critique are addressed in Chapter 4.

177. For *bodhicarām* I read with *Śikṣ* 321.8: *bodhivarāṃ* (= Tib. *byaṅ chub dam pa*).

178. In place of *bhavate, Śikṣ* 321.12 reads *labhate;* cf. Tib. *thob 'gyur.* I have read accordingly.

179. *Śikṣ* 321.15 reads *asama-* in place of *parama-*.

180. I read the MS as *labdhā,* contra Finot's *labdhvā* (see Ensink 1952, 52, n. 264).

181. While I am reasonably certain that this must be the meaning of *sugatau pratimaḥ* (cf. Tib. *bde gśegs mtshuṅs par*), the form is unexpected. It would appear that the author/scribe mistakenly made use of the loc. sing. ending for -i stems. *Śikṣ* 322.2 reads *sugatapratimo.*

182. I read *yad arjitam* with *Śikṣ* 322.4 instead of *yadārcitam;* Tib. *bsgrubs gyur pa* confirms the former reading.

183. Although the MS clearly reads *yaṣṭyā,* I have understood the word as *yaṣṭvā* with Ensink (1952, 53, n. 268) and against Edgerton (*BHSD* 445). On the use of the strong form of the verbal root (esp. √*yaj*) for the Sanskrit weak form, see *BHSG* §34.13. Tib. confirms this reading.

184. Tib. appears to read *aparimāṇā* here as *purima (sṅon chad),* "formerly." On the latter word see *BHSD* 348. Jg agrees with Tib.: 往昔布施難思議 (Formerly your offerings were difficult to conceive of).

185. Jg omits *samādhi* here and puts *dhyāna* (*chanding* 禪定) here in its place rather than in *pāda* b, thus listing only seven perfections.

186. Skt. reads *candrārkamaṇi-* here, but Tib. suggests *candrakāntamaṇi- (chu śel*

nor bu); see Shackleton-Bailey 1954, 81. For a parallel to this expression, see *SWTF,* fasc. 11, 232 (*candrakānta-sūryakā[nta-maṇ?]i*). I have read with Skt., with which Jg agrees.

187. Jg is corrupt here: he renders *pāda* a of v. 117, then the whole of v. 118, then *pāda* b of v. 117, after which he translates v. 119. *Pāda*s c and d of v. 117 are not represented at all.

188. Verses 118–123 describe features of the historical Buddha's biography as in reality supermundane *(lokānuvartana)* despite his seeming conformity to the ways of the world. This view on the life of the Buddha is famously linked to a branch of the Mahāsāṃghika tradition, but it is also quite common in a wide range of Mahāyāna literature—literature that may not have anything to do with the Mahāsāṃghikas.

189. This is a reference to the famous departure scene in the Buddha's biography where the women of the palace attempt to entice prince Gautama to remain, only to be cast asleep by the Akaniṣṭha gods and left sprawled on the palace floor. See, among other places, the *Buddhacarita,* chap. 5 (Johnston [1936] 1984, pt. 1: 51–55 [Skt.]; pt. 2: 70–75 [Eng.]).

190. Tib. understands this first line differently: "Relinquishing father and mother, son [reading *sras* with Derge and Narthang] and wives, his relatives were afflicted with grief, wailing senselessly." Jg appears to agree with this latter reading.

191. The four Māras are usually listed in Buddhist literature as the defilements *(kleśa-māra),* the aggregates *(skandha-māra),* death *(mṛtyu-māra),* and the divinity Māra *(devaputra-māra).* See *BHSD* 430 and Nakamura [1981] 1991, 532a.

192. For *pāda* c Jg has the following: 諸方菩薩尋光來 (From the cardinal directions bodhisattvas come seeking your radiance).

193. I follow Shackleton Bailey (1954, 81) in reading *mune* in place of *sati* here (cf. Tib. *thub pa*).

194. I am uncertain as to the precise meaning and significance of *māyādharma* here, which I take to be loc. sing. (see *BHSG* §8.11).

195. Tib. adds here "and his friends" *(grogs de dag daṅ).*

196. MS reads *niryātayati* (Finot: *niryatayati*). See La Vallée Poussin 1903, 312, n. 1.

197. Tib. seems to have read *abhivandya* as *anavadya (kha na ma tho ba med pa),* "faultless," modifying *cīvaro* (robe).

198. Dh's interpretation of this last sentence is rather different: 爾時德光太子令諸比丘不憂衣服 亦不想他比丘獨得衣被 (Then Prince Puṇyaraśmi induced the monks to not fret over robes and to not think that other monks alone received robes).

199. Jg adds "and the *saṅgha.*"

200. Finot reads *dhvāpitas,* but I read the MS as *dhyāpitas* (see *BHSD* 288; Edgerton reads *dhyāpitas* here without comment). It appears to be a hyper-Sanskritization related to Pāli *jhāpita.* Dh has uncharacteristically transcribed this verb *shewei* 闍維, which Coblin has hypothesized to have been pronounced *dźa *iui in Old Northwest Chinese (Coblin 1994, 143 and 229), equivalent to a probable MIA form *jhāvi(ta).* Jg also transcribes this verb: *shepi* 闍毗 (= MIA *jhāvi[ta]* or *jhāpi[ta]*). Dp transcribes it as *chapi* 荼毗, which presumably reflects a pronunciation close to our Skt. form.

201. Tib. reads 84; Jg reads 99. Dp reads with Skt.

202. Tib. has 64,000.

203. These are three of the classic *dhutaguṇas*; see the discussion of them and their role in early Mahāyāna *sūtra* literature in Chapter 3.

204. There is an eyeskip in Finot's edition at this point (57.18). Between *bhikṣuṇā* and *buddhasahasrasya* the MS reads: *parigṛhītaḥ | etenopāyena caturnavatīnāṃ buddhakoṭiniyutānāṃ* (noted also in Ensink 1952, 56, n. 278). This reading is confirmed by the Tibetan and all three Chinese translations.

205. I read *duḥkhābhisaṃskāra-* here as *duṣkarābhisaṃskāra-* with Tib. *(bya dka' ba mṅon par 'du bya ba).*

206. Jg is more specific: 然未來世有諸比丘 (But in the future there will be monks).

207. For *jñātyadhyavasitā,* Tib. has *śes kyi khe la chags pa* (attached to public reputation). There is frequently an interchange between *jñāti* (relatives) and *jñātra* (public reputation) in the relationship between the Skt. and Tib. redactions. It is not always clear which is to be preferred, since attachment to both is regularly cited as a source of corruption for the bodhisattva. I have translated with the Skt. but note where Tib. offers an alternative that may be preferable. Jg agrees with Skt. Dh appears to render this compound as "anxious" (*chousi* 愁思). I have no explanation for this.

208. In place of Skt. *svapratijñātaś cyutāḥ* I read *svapratijñātacyutāḥ* (Tib. *raṅ gi dam bcas pa las ñams pa*). Cf. *KP* 9 *(cyutapratijñāś).*

209. Note that Tib. here reads *saṅs rgyas kyi theg pa,* suggesting that its Sanskrit manuscript read *buddhayāna.* On the alternation of and possible confusion between *jñāna* and *yāna* in early Mahāyāna literature, see Karashima 1993 and Boucher 1998, 491–493.

210. *mokṣacittavirahitāḥ* is missing from the Tib.

211. Skt. reads *udyuktāni,* but I read with Tib.: *rigs pa med pa.* Dh's *wu xing zhe* 無行者 appears to confirm this reading as well.

212. Skt. *lābhārthikānām;* I read *lābhārthikāni.*

213. Skt. *daśabalacalite,* but I read *-carite* with de Jong (1953, 549) and Shackleton-Bailey (1954, 82) in light of Tib. *spyod pa.* Ensink's translation as "which deviates from the ten forces" clearly failed to recognize *daśabala-* as an epithet of the Buddha.

214. Here again Tib. reads *śes kyi khe* (public reputation) where Skt. has *jñātau.* See note 207 above. And again, Jg agrees with Skt.

215. The text has *parakula-* (lit. "other families") here, but consistent with my understanding of *kula* in the *RP* as "upper-class patrons," I have translated accordingly. See "Prologue," n. 97.

216. None of the Chin. translations have understood the reference to Māra.

217. Finot reads *kṣetrārthaṃ,* but I read the MS as *jñātrārthaṃ* (Tib. *śes kyi khe phyir*).

218. As Edgerton notes (*BHSD* 242), the form of the verb *jāhu* is problematic. I have accepted his interpretation of it as from √*hā* (to abandon, forsake, leave behind) based on Tib. *spaṅ.*

219. Contra Finot's *priyavadatāṃ,* I read the MS as *priyavad etāṃ.* Although Ensink (1952, 57, n. 283) reads as I do, he translates the text as *-vadatāṃ.*

220. For *kṣaṇaprāptā,* Jg has 應發大忍心 (should generate thoughts of great forbearance), as if from *kṣānti-*.

221. *Pāda* b is somewhat unusual and perhaps corrupt: *jñānaṃ tatra utpādayecchu ivātra.* Edgerton (*BHSD* 119) proposes reading *utpādaye(t) ucchu* (or *icchu;* Skt. *ikṣu,* "sugarcane"), though the Tib. is quite different: *raṅ gis 'dir ni kun tu śes pa bskyed par bya* (he would produce gnosis here entirely on his own). I agree with Edgerton, but I take *icchu* as from √*iṣ.*

222. Contra Finot's *paṭapaṃśī,* the MS reads *parapaṃśī* (see Ensink 1952, 58, n. 287).

223. Dh has understood this last *pāda* rather differently: 我本奉億佛教誡 (I originally received instruction and precepts from *koṭis* of buddhas).

224. I read the MS as *dharme* here.

225. For *śrutvā yukta sudurmanā bhāvitāraḥ,* Ensink (1952, 58, n. 288) has proposed the reading '*śrutvā yukta. . . .* I instead read *śrutvāyukta* (= *ayukta*). Clearly Tib. understood *pāda* b differently: *thos nas phyir źiṅ yid ni 'jug par bya ba'i rigs* (Hearing it, they will certainly apply their minds even more[?]). Dh appears to support my reading of the Skt.: 不能精進不樂聽 ([Those who] are not able to exert themselves assiduously will not be pleased to hear it). Jg's *wen yi* 聞已 (having heard it) also does not support Ensink's suggestion.

226. For *saṃcare* I read with Ensink (1952, 58, n. 289) *saṃvare* (cf. Tib. *sdom pa*).

227. I read *gaṇanām* with the MS in place of *śaṇanām,* already noted by La Vallée Poussin (1903, 312, n. 1).

228. Jg adds here: 亦名福焰菩薩大士往昔本行 (also call it "the former practice of the bodhisattva *mahāsattva* Puṇyaraśmi").

Bibliography

Adikaram, E. W. 1946. *Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon.* Colombo: M. D. Gunasena and Co.

Allon, Mark. 2001. *Three Gāndhārī Ekottarikāgama-Type Sūtras: British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments 12 and 14.* With a Contribution by Andrew Glass. Gandhāran Buddhist Texts 2. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Allon, Mark, and Richard Salomon. 2000. "Kharoṣṭhī Fragments of a Gāndhārī Version of the Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra." In Braarvig 2000a, 243–273.

Alsdorf, Ludwig. 1957. "Bemerkungen zum Vessantara-Jātaka." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd-und Ostasiens* 1: 1–70.

Arrington, Leonard J., and Davis Bitton. 1979. *The Mormon Experience: A History of the Latter-day Saints.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 2nd edition, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992.

Ashikaga Atsuuji 足利惇氏, ed. 1965. *Sukhāvatīvyūha.* Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

Atwood, Christopher. 1991. "Life in Third-Fourth Century Cadh'ota: A Survey of Information Gathered from the Prakrit Documents Found North of Minfeng (Niyä)." *Central Asiatic Journal* 35: 161–199.

Babb, Lawrence A. 1981. "Glancing: Visual Interaction in Hinduism." *Journal of Anthropological Research* 37: 387–401.

Bacot, M. J. 1914. "Drimedkundan: Une version tibétaine dialoguée du *Vessantara Jātaka.*" *Journal asiatique,* 221–305.

Bailey, Greg, and Ian Mabbett. 2003. *The Sociology of Early Buddhism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bailey, Harold W. 1946. "Gāndhārī." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11: 764–797.

Bainbridge, William Sims. 1997. *The Sociology of Religious Movements.* London/New York: Routledge.

Bapat, P. V. 1964. *Vimuktimārga Dhutaguṇa-Nirdeśa: A Tibetan Text Critically Edited and Translated into English.* New Delhi: Asia Publishing House.

Bareau, André. 1962. "La légende de la jeunesse du Buddha dans les *Vinayapiṭaka* anciens." *Oriens Extremus* 9.1: 6–33.

———. 1974. "La jeunesse du Buddha dans les *Sūtrapiṭaka* et les *Vinayapiṭaka* anciens." *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 61: 199–274.

———. 1988/1989. "Étude du bouddhisme." *Annuaire de collège de France* 533–547.

———. 1991. "Les agissements de Devadatta selon les chapitres relatifs au schisme dans les divers *Vinayapiṭaka.*" *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 78: 87–132.

——. 1995. *Recherches sur la biographie du Buddha dans les Sūtrapiṭaka et les Vinayapiṭaka anciens.* Vol. 3. Paris: Presses de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient.

Barrett, Timothy H. 1998. "Did I-Ching Go to India? Problems in Using I-ching as a Source for South Asian Buddhism." *Buddhist Studies Review* 15.2: 142–156.

Barua, Dwijendralal. 1946. "'Buddhakhetta' in the Apadāna." In *B.C. Law Volume,* part 2, edited by D. R. Bhandarkar et al., 183–190. Poona: The Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

Basham, Arthur Llewellyn. 1981. "The Evolution of the Concept of the Bodhisattva." In *The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhism,* edited by Leslie S. Kawamura, 19–59. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfred Laurier University Press.

Beal, Samuel. 1884. *Si-Yu-Ki: Buddhist Records of the Western World; Translated from the Chinese of Hiuen Tsiang (A.D. 629).* London. Rpt. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1981.

Bechert, Heinz. 1973. "Notes on the Formation of Buddhist Sects and the Origins of Mahāyāna." In *German Scholars on India,* vol. 1, 6–18. Varanasi: The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.

——, ed. 1980. *Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung / The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

——. 1992. "Buddha-Field and Transfer of Merit in a Theravāda Source." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 35: 95–108.

Bendall, Cecil, ed. 1897–1902. *Śikṣāsamuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhistic Teaching Compiled by Śāntideva Chiefly from Earlier Mahāyāna-Sūtras.* Bibliotheca Buddhica 1. St. Petersburg. Rpt. Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1970.

Benn, James A. 1998. "Where Text Meets Flesh: Burning the Body as an Apocryphal Practice in Chinese Buddhism." *History of Religions* 37.4: 295–322.

——. 2001. "Burning for the Buddha: Self-Immolation in Chinese Buddhism." Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Berkowitz, Alan J. 2000. *Patterns of Disengagement: The Practice and Portrayal of Reclusion in Early Medieval China.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bernhard, Franz. 1970. "Gāndhārī and the Buddhist Mission in Central Asia." In *Añjali: Felicitation Volume Presented to Oliver Hector de Alewis Wijesekera on his Sixtieth Birthday,* edited by J. Tilakasiri, 55–69. Peradeniya: University of Ceylon.

Beyer, Stephan. 1977. "Notes on the Vision Quest in Early Mahāyāna." In Lancaster 1977, 329–340.

Birnbaum, Raoul. 1979. *The Healing Buddha.* Boston: Shambala Publications. Revised edition 1989.

Böhtlingk, Otto. 1879–1889. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung.* 7 fascicles. St. Petersburg: Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Bokenkamp, Stephen R. 1997. *Early Daoist Scriptures.* With a Contribution by Peter Nickerson. Berkeley: University of California Press.

——. 2006. "The *Viśvantara-Jātaka* in Buddhist and Daoist Translation." In *Daoism in History: Essays in Honour of Liu Ts'un-yan,* edited by Benjamin Penny, 56–73. London/New York: Routledge.

Boltz, William. 1994. *The Origin and Early Development of the Chinese Writing System.* American Oriental Series, vol. 78. New Haven: American Oriental Society.

Bongard-Levin, Gregory, Daniel Boucher, Takamichi Fukita, and Klaus Wille. 1996. "The Nagaropamasūtra: An Apotropaic Text from the Saṃyuktāgama, A Transliteration, Reconstruction, and Translation of the Central Asian Sanskrit Manuscripts." In *Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon: Neuentdeckungen und Neueditionen III,* 7–131. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Boucher, Daniel. 1996. "Buddhist Translation Procedures in Third-Century China: A Study of Dharmarakṣa and His Translation Idiom." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

———. 1998. "Gāndhārī and the Early Chinese Buddhist Translations Reconsidered: The Case of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra.*" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 118.4: 471–506.

———. 2000a. "On *Hu* and *Fan* Again: The Transmission of 'Barbarian' Manuscripts to China." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 23.1: 7–28.

———. 2000b. Review of Salomon 1999. *Sino-Platonic Papers* 98: 58–71.

———. 2001. "The Textual History of the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā:* Notes on Its Third-Century Chinese Translation." *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology for the Academic Year 2000,* 4: 93–115.

———. 2002. Review of Braarvig 2000a. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 45.3: 245–259.

———. 2005. Review of Allon 2001. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 48.3–4: 289–295.

———. 2006. "Dharmarakṣa and the Transmission of Buddhism to China." In *China at the Crossroads: A Festschrift in Honor of Victor H. Mair.* Special Issue of *Asia Major,* 3rd ser., 19, pts. 1–2: 13–37.

Bowring, Richard. 1992. "Buddhist Translations in the Northern Sung." *Asia Major,* 3rd ser., 5.2: 79–93.

Boyer, A. M., E. J. Rapson, and E. Senart, eds. 1918. "Une tablette Kharoṣṭhī-Sanskrite." *Journal asiatique,* 11th ser., 12: 319–327.

———. 1920–1927. *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions Discovered by Sir Aurel Stein in Chinese Turkestan.* Pts. 1–2. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Braarvig, Jens, ed. 2000a. *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection I: Buddhist Manuscripts.* Vol. 1. Oslo: Hermes Publishing.

———. 2000b. "Sarvadharmāpravṛttinirdeśa." In Braarvig 2000a, 81–166.

Brancaccio, Pia, and Kurt Behrendt, eds. 2006. *Gandhāran Buddhism: Archeology, Art, Texts.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Brough, John. 1949–1950. "Thus Have I Heard. . . ." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 13.2: 416–426.

———. 1962. *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada.* London: Oxford University Press.

———. 1964. "The Chinese Pseudo-Translation of Ārya-Śūra's *Jātakamālā.*" *Asia Major,* n.s. 11.1: 27–53.

———. 1965. "Comments on Third-Century Shan-Shan and the History of Buddhism." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 28: 582–612.

Brown, Peter. 1971a. "The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity." *Journal of Roman Studies* 61: 80–101. Reprinted in Brown, *Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982; rpt. 1989.

———. 1971b. *The World of Late Antiquity: AD 150–750.* London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Brown, Robert. 1997. "Narrative as Icon: The Jātaka Stories in Ancient Indian and Southeast Asian Architecture." In Schober 1997, 64–109.

Bunnag, Jane. 1973. *Buddhist Monk, Buddhist Layman: A Study of Urban Monastic Organization in Central Thailand.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burnouf, Eugène. 1852. *Le lotus de la bonne loi.* Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.

Burrow, Thomas. 1937. *The Language of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1940. *A Translation of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan.* London: Royal Asiatic Society.

Callieri, Pierfrancesco. 2006. "Buddhist Presence in the Urban Settlements of Swāt, Second Century BCE to Fourth Century CE." In Brancaccio and Behrendt 2006, 60–82.

Carrithers, Michael. 1979. "The Modern Ascetics of Lanka and the Pattern of Change in Buddhism." *Man,* n.s. 14: 294–310.

———. 1983. *The Forest Monks of Sri Lanka: An Anthropological and Historical Study.* Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Chandra, Lokesh. 1976. *Saddharma-Puṇḍarīka-Sūtra: Kashgar Manuscript.* New Delhi: The International Academy of Indian Culture. Rpt. Tokyo: The Reiyukai, 1977.

Chang, Garma C. C. 1983. *A Treasury of Mahāyāna Sūtras: Selections from the Mahāratnakūṭa Sūtra.* University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Chapple, Christopher Key. 1997. "Animals and Environment in the Buddhist Birth Stories." In *Buddhism and Ecology: The Interconnection of Dharma and Deeds,* edited by Mary Evelyn Tucker and Duncan Ryūken Williams, 131–148. Harvard University Center for the Study of World Religions. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Char, S. V. R. 1991. "Methods and Principles Used in Translating the Buddhist Tripiṭaka into Chinese." *Chinese Culture* 32.3: 37–47.

Chau, Thich Mihn. 1991. *The Chinese Madhyama Āgama and the Pāli Majjhima Nikāya: A Comparative Study.* Buddhist Traditions 15. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Chavannes, Edouard. 1903. "Voyage de Song Yun dans l'Udyāna et le Gandhāra (518–522 p.C.)." *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 3: 379–441.

———. 1905. "Jinagupta (528–605 après J.-C.). *T'oung Pao,* ser. 2, 6: 332–356.

———. 1910–1934. *Cinq cents contes et apologues extraits du Tripitika chinois.* 4 vols. Paris: Ernest Leroux. Rpt. Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1962.

Chen Guocan 陳國燦. 1983. "Tulufan chutude 'Zhufo yaoji jing' canjuan yu Dunhuang gaoseng Zhufahu de yijing kaolüe" 吐魯蕃出土的『諸佛要集經』殘卷與敦煌高僧竺法護的譯經考略 [A Brief Examination of the Extant Part of the *Buddhasaṃgītisūtra* Found at Turfan and the Sūtras Translated by the Eminent Monk of Dunhuang Dharmarakṣa]. *Dunhuang xue jikan* 敦煌學輯刊 [Collected Articles on Dunhuang Studies] 4: 6–13.

Ch'en, Kenneth. 1954. Review of Ensink 1952. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 17: 274–281.

———. 1960. "Some Problems in the Translation of the Chinese Buddhist Canon." *Qinghua xuebao* 清華學報 [Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies], n.s. 2.1: 178–186.

Coblin, W. South. 1983. *A Handbook of Eastern Han Sound Glosses.* Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.

———. 1994. *A Compendium of Phonetics in Northwest Chinese.* Journal of Chinese Linguistics Monograph Series, no. 7.

Collins, Randall. 1997. "Stark and Bainbridge, Durkheim and Weber: Theoretical Comparisons." In Young 1997, 161–180.

Collins, Steven. 1998. *Nirvana and Other Buddhist Felicities: Utopias of the Pali Imaginaire.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cone, Margaret, and Richard F. Gombrich. 1977. *The Perfect Generosity of Prince Vessantara.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Conze, Edward. 1965. "The Buddha's Lakṣaṇas in the Prajñāpāramitā." *Journal of the Oriental Institute* (Baroda) 225–229.

———. 1973. *The Perfection of Wisdom in Eight Thousand Lines and Its Verse Summary.* Bolinas: Four Seasons Foundation.

———. 1974a. *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā: Chapters 70 to 82 Corresponding to the 6th, 7th, and 8th Abhisamayas.* Rome: Istituto Italiano Per Il Medio Ed Estremo Oriente.

———. 1974b. *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā.* 2nd ed. Rome: Istituto Italiano Per Il Medio Ed Estremo Oriente.

———. 1975. *The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom with the Divisions of the Abhisamayālaṅkāra.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Coomaraswamy, Ananda K. 1928. "The Buddha's *cūḍā,* Hair, *uṣṇīṣa,* and Crown." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 815–840.

———. 1943. "*Saṃvega:* Aesthetic Shock." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 7. Rpt. *Coomaraswamy,* 1: *Selected Papers; Traditional Art and Symbolism,* edited by Roger Lipsey, 179–185. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977.

Cowell, Edward B., gen. ed. 1895–1913. *The Jātaka or Stories of the Buddha's Former Births.* 6 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Rpt. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1994.

Cowell, E. B., and R. A. Neil, eds. 1886. *The Divyāvadāna: A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crosby, Kate, and Andrew Skilton. 1995. *Śāntideva: The Bodhicaryāvatāra.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cunningham, Alexander. 1879. *The Stūpa of Bharhut: A Buddhist Monument Ornamented with Numerous Sculptures Illustrated of Buddhist Legend and History in the Third Century B.C.* London. Rpt. Varanasi, 1962.

Cutler, Sally Mellick. 1994. "The Pāli Apadāna Collection." *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 20: 1–42.

Dantinne, Jean. 1983. *La splendeur de l'inébranlable (Akṣobhyavyūha),* vol. 1 (Chapters 1–3): *Les auditeurs (Śrāvaka).* Louvain-La-Neuve: Institut Orientaliste.

———. 1991. *Les qualités de l'ascète (Dhutaguṇa): Étude sémantique et doctrinale.* Brussels: Thanh-Long.

Das, Sarat Chandra, and Harimohan Vīdyābhūśana, eds. 1888–1918. *Avadānakalpalatā: A Collection of Legendary Stories about the Bodhisattvas.* 2 vols. Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal.

Das Gupta, Kabita. 1978. "Viśvantarāvadāna: Eine Buddhistische Legende, Edition eines Textes auf Sanskrit und auf Tibetisch. Eingeleitet und Übersetzt." Inauguraldissertation, Freie Universität, Berlin.

Deeg, Max. 1999. "The Saṅgha of Devadatta: Fiction and History of a Heresy in the Buddhist Tradition." *Kokusai bukkyōgaku daigakuin daigaku kenkyū kiyō* 国際仏教学大学院大学研究紀要 [Journal of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies] 2: 183–218.

Dehejia, Vidya. 1990. "On Modes of Visual Narration in Early Buddhist Art." *Art Bulletin* 72.3: 374–392.

———. 1997. *Discourse in Early Buddhist Art: Visual Narratives of India.* New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.

de Jong, J. W. 1953. Review of Ensink 1952. *Journal asiatique* 241.4: 545–549.

———. 1954. "L'épisode d'Asita dans le Lalitavistara." In *Asiatica: Festschrift Friedrich Weller,* edited by Johannes Schubert, 312–325. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz.

———. 1967. "Remarks on the Text of the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā.*" *Adyar Library Bulletin* 1–7.

———. 1977. "Sanskrit Fragments of the Kāśyapaparivarta." *Beiträge zur Indienforschung: Ernst Waldschmidt zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet,* 247–255. Berlin: Museum für Indische Kunst.

Deleanu, Florin. 1992. "Ansekō yaku 'Anban shui kyō' genkōhon no seiritsu ni tsuite" 安世高訳「安般守意経」現行本の成立について [On the Formation of the Extant Text of the *Anban shouyi jing* Translated by An Shigao]. *Tōyō no shisō to shūkyō* 東洋思と宗教 [Oriental Thought and Religion] 9: 48–63.

———. 2000. "Buddhist 'Etiology' in the Pāli Canon: Between Symbol and Observation." *The Eastern Buddhist,* n.s. 32.2: 79–127.

———. 2003. "The Newly Found Text of the *Anban shouyi jing* Translated by An Shigao." *Kokusai bukkyōgaku daigakuin daigaku kenkyū kiyō* 国際仏教学大学院大学研究紀要 [Journal of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies] 6: 63–99.

Demiéville, Paul. 1954. "La *Yogācārabhūmi* de Saṅgharakṣa." *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 44.2: 339–436.

Douglas, Mary. 1970. *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology.* London: Barrie and Rockliff: The Cresset Press. Rpt. New York: Pantheon Books, 1982.

Dresden, Mark J. 1955. "The Jātakastava or 'Praise of the Buddha's Former Births': Indo-Scythian (Khotanese) Text, English Translation, Grammatical Notes, and Glossaries." *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society,* n.s. 45.5: 397–508.

Durt, Hubert. 1979. "Chōsō." In *Hōbōgirin: Dictionnaire encyclopédique du Bouddhisme d'après les sources chinoises et japonaises,* fascicle 5, 421–430. Edited by Jacques May. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve and Tokyo: Maison Franco-Japonaise.

———. 1991. "Bodhisattva and Layman in the Early Mahāyāna." *Japanese Religions* 16.3: 1–16.
———. 1998. "Two Interpretations of Human-Flesh Offering: Misdeed or Supreme Sacrifice." *Kokusai bukkyōgaku daigakuin daigaku kenkyū kiyō* 国際仏教学大学院大学研究紀要 [Journal of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies] 1: 57–83.
———. 1999. "The Offering of the Children of Prince Viśvantara/Sudāna in the Chinese Tradition." *Kokusai bukkyōgaku daigakuin daigaku kenkyū kiyō* 国際仏教学大学院大学研究紀要 [Journal of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies] 2: 147–182.
———. 2000. "The Casting-Off of Mādrī in the Northern Buddhist Literary Tradition." *Kokusai bukkyōgaku daigakuin daigaku kenkyū kiyō* 国際仏教学大学院大学研究紀要 [Journal of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies] 3: 133–158.
Dutt, Nalinaksha. 1939–1959. *Gilgit Manuscripts.* 4 vols. Srinagar. Rpt. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1984.
———. 1970. *Buddhist Sects in India.* Rpt. Calcutta, 1977.
Eberhard, Wolfram. 1956. "The Leading Families of Ancient Tun-huang." *Sinologica* 4.4: 209–231.
Eck, Diana L. 1981. *Darśan: Seeing the Divine Image in India.* 3rd ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.
Edgerton, Franklin. 1953a. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary.* 2 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press. Rpt. Kyoto: Rinsen Book Co., 1985.
———. 1953b. Review of Ensink 1952. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 73: 169–170.
Egge, James R. 2003. "Interpretive Strategies for Seeing the Body of the Buddha." In Holt et al. 2003, 189–208.
Ehara, N. R. M., Soma Thera, and Kheminda Thera. 1961. *The Path of Freedom by the Arahant Upatissa.* Colombo: D. R. D. Weersuria.
Eimer, Helmut. 1992. *Ein Jahrzehnt Studien zur Überlieferung des tibetischen Kanjur.* Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien.
Emmerick, Ronald E. 1983. "Some Remarks on Translation Techniques of the Khotanese." In Röhrborn and Veenker 1983, 17–26.
Endō Toshiichi. 1990. "Some Significant Epithets and Qualities of the Buddha as Found in the Milindapañha." In *Ānanda: Papers on Buddhism and Indology, A Felicitation Volume Presented to Ananda Weihena Palliya Guruge on his Sixtieth Birthday,* edited by Y. Karunadasa, 160–171. Colombo: Vision House.
Enomoto Fumio 榎本文雄. 1994. "A Note on Kashmir as Referred to in Chinese Literature: Ji-bin." In *A Study of the Nīlamata: Aspects of Hinduism in Ancient Kashmir,* edited by Yasuke Ikari, 357–365. Kyoto: Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University.
Enomoto Masaaki 榎本正明. 1992. "Shinshutsu Nanatsu-derazō 'Zudakyō'—eiin honkoku" 新出七蔵『頭陀経』一影印翻刻 [A Newly Discovered Version of the *Toutuo jing*

from the Repository at Nanatsu-dera]. *Kachō tanki daigaku kenkyū kiyō* 華頂短期大学研究紀要 [Research Bulletin of Kachō Junior College] 37: 1–16.

Ensink, Jacob. 1952. *The Question of Rāṣṭrapāla: Translated and Annotated.* Zwolle: J. J. Tijl.

Fausbøll, Michael Viggo, ed. 1896. *The Jātaka, Together with its Commentary, Being Tales of the Anterior Births of Gotama Buddha.* Vol. 6. London: Trübner and Co. Rpt. London: The Pali Text Society, 1964.

Feer, M. Léon. 1899. "Les Jātakas dans les mémoires de Hiouen-Thsang." *Actes du onzième congrès international des orientalistes, Paris 1897,* section 1: *Langues et archéologie des pays ariens.* Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.

Figueira, Dorothy Matilda. 1991. *Translating the Orient: The Reception of Śākuntala in Nineteenth-Century Europe.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Filliozat, Jean. 1963. "La mort volontaire par le feu et la tradition bouddhique indienne." *Journal asiatique* 251: 21–51.

Finot, Louis. 1901. *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā: Sūtra du Mahāyāna.* St. Petersburg: Academy of Sciences. Rpt. The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1957.

Foguang da cidian 佛光大辭典. 1988. 7 vols. plus index. Gaoxiong, Taiwan: Foguang Temple.

Forte, Antonino. 1984. "The Activities in China of the Tantric Master Manicintana (Pao-ssu-wei 寶思惟: ?–721 A.D.) from Kashmir and of His Northern Indian Collaborators." *East and West,* n.s. 34: 301–345.

Foucaux, P. E. de. 1884. *Le Lalitavistara: L'histoire traditionelle de la vie du Bouddha Śakyamuni.* Paris: Ernest Leroux. Rpt. Paris: Les Deux Océans, 1988.

Foucher, Alfred. 1905. *Les bas-reliefs gréco-bouddhiques du Gandhāra.* Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.

———. 1918. *L'art gréco-bouddhique du Gandhāra: Étude sur les origines de l'influence classique dans l'art bouddhique de l'Inde et de l'Extrême-Orient.* Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.

Frye, Stanley. 1981. *The Sutra of the Wise and the Foolish (mdo bdzans blun) or The Ocean of Narratives (üliger-ün dalai).* Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives.

Fuchs, Walter. 1930. "Zur technischen Organisation der Übersetzungen buddhistischer Schriften ins Chinesische." *Asia Major* 6: 84–103.

Fukita Takamichi 吹田隆道. 1993. "'Daihonkyō' ni miru budda no kyōtsūka to hō reberuka" 「大本経」に見る仏陀の共通化と法レベル化 [Common Characteristics of a Buddha as an Expression of Dharma in the *Mahāvadānasūtra*]. In *Genshi bukkyō to daijō bukkyō—Watanabe Fumimaro hakushi tsuitō kinen ronshū* 原始仏教と大乗仏教ー渡辺文麿博士追悼記念論集 [Studies in Original Buddhism and Mahāyāna Buddhism in Commemoration of Late Professor Dr. Fumimaro Watanabe], edited by Mayeda Egaku, 271–283. Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō.

———. ed. 2003. *The Mahāvadānasūtra: A New Edition Based on Manuscripts Discovered in Northern Turkestan.* Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Funayama Toru 船山徹. 2002. "Shashin no shisō—rokuchō bukkyōshi no ichi dammen" 捨身の思想ー六朝仏教史の一断面 [Reflections on "Sacrificing the Body": A Cross-section of Six Dynasties Buddhist History]. *Tōhō gakuhō* 東方学方 [Journal of Oriental Studies] 74: [358]-[311].

Fussman, Gérard. 1989. "Gāndhārī écrite, Gāndhārī parlée." In *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes,* edited by Collette Caillat, 433–501. Paris: Collège de France.

Gabaude, Louis. 1991. "Controverses modernes autour du Vessantara Jataka." *Cahiers de l'Asie du Sud-est* 29–30: 51–73.

Galloway, Brian. 1991. "Thus Have I Heard: At One Time. . . ." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 34.2: 87–104.

———. 1997. "A Reply to Professor Mark Tatz." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 40.4: 367–371.

Gauthiot, Robert. 1911. "Paonano Pao." *Mélanges d'Indianisme offerts par ses élèves à M. Sylvain Lévi,* 111–120. Paris: Ernest Leroux.

———. 1912. "Une version sogdienne du Vessantara Jātaka." *Journal asiatique* 19: 163–193 and 429–510.

Gernet, Jacques. 1960. "Les suicides par le feu chez les bouddhistes chinois du V^e au X^e siècle." *Mélanges publiés par l'Institut des Hautes Études chinoises* 2: 527–258.

Gethin, Rupert. 1998. *The Foundations of Buddhism.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Getz, Daniel A., Jr. 1999. "T'ien-t'ai Pure Land Societies and the Creation of the Pure Land Patriarchate." In *Buddhism in the Sung,* edited by Peter N. Gregory and Daniel A. Getz, Jr., 477–523. Kuroda Institute Studies in East Asian Buddhism 13. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Gill, Sandra. 2000. "Le discours de portails: Procédés de création dans la sculpture des portails du *stūpa* majeur de Sāñcī." *Arts asiatiques* 55: 32–54.

Givens, Terryl L. 2002. *By the Hand of Mormon: The American Scripture That Launched a New World Religion.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Glass, Andrew. 2004. "Kharoṣṭhī Manuscripts: A Window on Gandhāran Buddhism." *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism: Saṃbhāṣā* 24: 129–152.

Gombrich, Richard. 1990. "How the Mahāyāna Began." In *The Buddhist Forum,* vol. 1, edited by T. Skorupski, 21–30. London: University of London (SOAS).

Gómez, Luis O. 1996. *The Land of Bliss: The Paradise of the Buddha of Measureless Light; Sanskrit and Chinese Versions of the Sukhāvatīvyūha Sūtras.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press and Kyoto: Higashi Honganji Shinshū Ōtani-ha.

Gonda, Jan. 1969. *Eye and Gaze in the Veda.* Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.

Goswami, Bijoya. 2001. *Lalitavistara: English Translation with Notes.* Bibliotheca Indica Series, no. 320. Kolkata: The Asiatic Society.

Granoff, Phyllis. 1991. "The Sacrifice of Maṇicūda: The Context of Narrative Action as a Guide to Interpretation." *Kalyāṇa-Mitta: Professor Hajime Nakamura Felicitation Volume,* edited by V. N. Jha, 225–239. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.

Grey, Leslie. 2000. *A Concordance of Buddhist Birth Stories.* 3rd edition. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.

Hachiriki Hiroki 八力広喜. 1989. "'Jūjūbibasharon' ni okeru bosatsu shisō seiritsu no haikei—haikai bosatsu kō" 『十住毘婆沙論』における菩薩思想成立の背景一敗壊菩薩考 [Background on the Development of the Conception of the Bodhisattva in the *Daśabhūmikavibhāṣa-śāstra:* An Examination of the Corrupt Bodhisattva]. In *Indo tetsugaku to bukkyō: Fujita Kōtatsu hakushi kanreki kinen ronshū* インド哲学と仏教一藤田宏達博士還暦記念論集 [Indian Philosophy and Buddhism: Essays in Honor of Professor Kōtatsu Fujita on His Sixtieth Birthday], 415–432. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten.

Hahn, Michael. 1992. *Haribhaṭṭa and Gopadatta: Two Authors in the Succession of Āryaśūra; On the Rediscovery of Parts of Their Jātakamālās.* 2nd ed. Studia Philologica Buddhica. Occasional Paper Series 1. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

Handurukande, Ratna. 1984. *Five Buddhist Legends in the Campū Style: From a Collection Named Avadānasārasamuccaya.* Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.

Hansen, Valerie. 2004. "Religious Life in a Silk Road Community: Niya during the Third and Fourth Centuries." In *Religion and Chinese Society,* vol. 1: *Ancient and Medieval China,* edited by John Lagerway, 279–315. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press and Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient.

Hanshu 漢書. Compiled by Ban Gu 班固. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1962 (cited by *juan* and page number).

Harrison, Paul M. 1978. *The Tibetan Text of the Pratyutpanna-Buddha-Saṃmukhāvasthita-Samādhi-Sūtra.* Studia Philologica Buddhica. Monograph Series 1. Tokyo: The Reiyukai Library.

———. 1990. *The Samādhi of Direct Encounter with the Buddhas of the Present: An Annotated English Translation of the Tibetan Version of the Pratyutpanna-Buddha-Saṃmukhāvasthita-Samādhi-Sūtra.* Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series 5 Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

———. 1992a. "Commemoration and Identification in *Buddhānusmṛti.*" In *In the Mirror of Memory: Reflections on Mindfulness and Remembrance in Indian and Tibetan Buddhism,* edited by Janet Gyatso, 215–238. Albany: State University of New York Press.

———. 1992b. *Druma-kinnara-rāja-paripṛcchā-sūtra: A Critical Edition of the Tibetan Text (Recension A) Based on Eight Editions of the Kanjur and the Dunhuang Manuscript Fragment.* Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series 7. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

———. 1992c. "Meritorious Activity or Waste of Time? Some Remarks on the Editing of Texts in the Tibetan Kanjur." *Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the 5th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Narita 1989,* vol. 1, edited by Ihara Shōren and Yamaguchi Zuihō, 77–93. Narita: Naritasan Shinshoji.

———. 1993. "The Earliest Chinese Translations of Mahāyāna Buddhist Sūtras: Some Notes on the Works of Lokakṣema." *Buddhist Studies Review* 10.2: 135–177.

———. 1995. "Searching for the Origins of the Mahāyāna: What Are We Looking For?" *Eastern Buddhist,* n.s. 28.1: 48–69.

———. 1997. "The *Ekottarikāgama* Translations of An Shigao." In Kieffer-Pülz and Hartmann 1997, 261–283.

———. 2004. "How the Buddha Became a *Bodhisattva*." In *Buddhist Scriptures,* edited by Donald S. Lopez, Jr., 172–184. London: Penguin Books.

Harvey, Peter. 1995. *The Selfless Mind: Personality, Consciousness and Nirvana in Early Buddhism.* Surrey, U.K.: Curzon Press.

Hasuike Toshitake 蓮池利隆. 1996. "Shinkyō Niya iseki shutsudo no bukkyō bunken ni tsuite (1)" 新彊ニヤ遺跡出土の文献について(1) [On Buddhist Literature Excavated from the Ruins of Niya in Xinjiang]. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* インド学仏教学研究 [Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies] 44.2: [164]–[166].

———. 1997. "Shinkyō Niya iseki shutsudo no bukkyō bunken ni tsuite (2)" 新彊ニヤ遺跡出土の文献について(2) [On Buddhist Literature Excavated from the Ruins of Niya in Xinjiang]. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* インド学仏教学研究 [Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies] 45.2: [183]–[187].

Hatch, Nathan O. 2001. "The Populist Vision of Joseph Smith." In *Mormons and Mormonism: An Introduction to an American World Religion,* edited by Eric A. Eliason, 123–136. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. Rpt. from Nathan O. Hatch, *The Democratization of American Christianity,* 113–122. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

Held, Axel. 1972. "Der buddhistischer Mönch Yen-ts'ung (557–610) und seine Übersetzungstheorie." Inauguraldissertation, Universität zu Köln.

Hendricks, Robert G. 1983. *Philosophy and Argumentation in Third Century China: The Essays of Hsi K'ang.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hinüber, Oskar von. 1968. *Studien zur Kasussyntax des Pāli, besonders des Vinaya-Piṭaka.* Munich: J. Kitzinger.

———. 1978. "Pāli *Gotrabhū:* The Origin and Early Linguistic History of a Philosophical Term." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 128: 326–332. Rpt. in von Hinüber, *Selected Papers on Pāli Studies,* 91–100. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 1994.

———. 1982. "Upāli's Verses in the Majjhimanikāya and the Madhyamāgama." In *Indological and Buddhist Studies: Volume in Honour of Professor J. W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday,* edited by L. A. Hercus et al., 243–251. Canberra: Faculty of Asian Studies.

———. 1983. "Sanskrit und Gāndhārī in Zentralasien." In Röhrborn and Veenker 1983, 27–34.

———. 2001. *Das Ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick.* Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

———. 2002. Review of H. Bechert, *Der Buddhismus,* 1: *Der indische Buddhismus und seine Verzweigungen.* By Heinz Bechert, Johannes Bronkhorst, Jacob Ensink, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Petra Kieffer-Pülz, Hans-Joachim Klimkeit, Siegfried Lienhard, Ian William Mabbett. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2000. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 45: 77–86.

Hirakawa Akira 平川彰. 1957. "Shoki daijō kyōdan ni okeru tōji no imi" 初期大乗教団における塔寺の意味 [The Significance of the *Stūpa*-monastery in Early Mahāyāna Orders]. *Shūkyō kenkyū* 宗教研究 [Journal of Religious Studies] 153: 151–172.

———. 1963. "The Rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism and Its Relationship to the Worship of Stūpas." *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Tōyō Bunko* 22: 57–106.

———. 1968. *Shoki daijō bukkyō no kenkyū* 初期大乗仏教の研究 [A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism]. Rev. ed. 2 vols. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1989/1990.

———. 1973. "Roku haramitsu no tenkai" 六波羅密の展開 [The Development of the Six Perfections]. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* インド学仏教学研究 [Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies] 21.2: 23–35.

———. 1990. *A History of Indian Buddhism: From Śākyamuni to Early Mahāyāna.* Translated and edited by Paul Groner. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

———. 1991. "Shoki daijō bukkyō ni okeru zaike to shukke" 初期大乗仏教における在家と出家 [Householders and Renunciants in Early Mahāyāna Buddhism]. *Bukkyō gaku* 仏教学 [Buddhist Studies] 31: 1–39.

Hoernle, A. F. Rudolf. 1916. *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan.* Oxford. Rpt. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publication, 1988.

Hokazono Kōichi 外薗幸一, ed. 1994. *Raritavisutara no kenkyū* ラリタヴィスタラの研究 [A Study of the Lalitavistara]. Vol. 1. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha.

Holt, John Clifford, Jacob N. Kinnard, and Jonathan S. Walters, eds. 2003. *Constituting Communities: Theravāda Buddhism and the Religious Cultures of South and Southeast Asia.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Holzman, Donald. 1956. "Les sept sages de la forêt des bambous et la société de leur temps." *T'oung Pao* 44: 317–346.

———. 1976. *Poetry and Politics: The Life and Works of Juan Chi, A.D. 210–263.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hopkins, Steven Paul. 2002. *Singing the Body of God: The Hymns of Vedāntadeśika in Their South Indian Tradition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Horner, I. B. 1951. *The Book of Discipline (Vinaya Piṭaka).* Vol. 4 (Mahāvagga). Oxford: The Pali Text Society. Rpt. 2000.

———. 1952. *The Book of Discipline (Vinaya Piṭaka).* Vol. 5 (Cullavagga). Oxford: The Pali Text Society. Rpt. 1988.

———. 1963/1964. *Milinda's Questions.* 2 vols. London: Luzac and Company, Ltd.

———. 1975. *The Minor Anthologies of the Pali Canon,* part 3: *Chronicle of Buddhas (Buddhavaṃsa) and Basket of Conduct (Cariyāpiṭaka).* Oxford: The Pali Text Society. Rpt. 2000.

Hrdličková, V. 1958. "The First Translations of Buddhist Sūtras in Chinese Literature and Their Place in the Development of Storytelling." *Archiv Orientální* 26: 114–144.

Hultzsch, Eugen. 1912. "Jatakas at Bharhut." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 399–410.

Iannaccone, Laurence R. 1994. "Why Strict Churches Are Strong." *American Journal of Sociology* 99.5: 1180–1211.

Ichikawa Yoshifumi 市川良文. 1999. "Niya iseki o meguru shomondai—toku ni chadōta ni okeru bukkyōsō no jittai o chūshin to shite" ニヤ遺跡をめぐる諸問題–特にチャドータにおける仏教僧の実態を中心として [Some Problems Concerning the Niya Remains: the Actual Situation of the Buddhist Monks in Caḍh'ota]. *Bukkyō shigaku kenkyū* 仏教史学研究 [Journal of Buddhist History] 42.1: 1–37.

Itō Shinkai 伊東信海. 1938. "*Bonmon* Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā *gemon no kenkyū* (1)" 梵文 Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā 偈文の研究 (一) [A Study of the Verse Sections of the Sanskrit Text of the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā* (1)]. *Taishō daigaku gakuhō* 大正大学学報 [The Journal of Taishō University] 28: 1–21.

———. 1940. "*Bonmon* Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā *gemon no kenkyū* (2)" 梵文 Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā 偈文の研究 (二) [A Study of the Verse Sections of the Sanskrit Text of the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā* (2)]. *Taishō daigaku gakuhō* 大正大学学報 [The Journal of Taishō University] 30–31: 1–19.

Iwamatsu Asao 岩松浅夫. 1982. "'Muryō' to 'kanro'" 「無量」と「甘露」 ["Immeasurable" and "Nectar"]. In *Bukkyō kyōri no kenkyū: Tamura Hōrō hakushi kanreki kinen ronshū* 仏教教理の研究ー田村芳朗博士還暦記念論集 [Studies in Buddhist Doctrine: Essays in Honor of Professor Tamura Hōrō on His Retirement], 183–194. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

———. 1985. "'Tenchūten' kō" 「天中天」考 [An Examination of the Epithet "*Devātideva*"]. *Tōhō* 東方 [The East] 1: 201–219.

———. 2001. "Karōshutei bunsho dai 511ban ni tsuite (1)" カろーシュテイー文書第５１１番について (1) [On *Kharoṣṭhī* Document Number 511 (1)]. *Sōka daigaku jinbun ronshū* 創価大学人文論集 [Collected Essays in the Humanities at Sōka University] 13: 157–191.

———. 2002. "Karōshutei bunsho dai 511ban ni tsuite (2)" カろーシュテイー文書 第５１１番について (1) [On *Kharoṣṭhī* Document Number 511 (2)]. *Sōka daigaku jinbun ronshū* 創価大学人文論集 [Collected Essays in the Humanities at Sōka University] 14: 183–204.

Jan, Yün-hua. 1965. "Buddhist Self-Immolation in Medieval China." *History of Religions* 4.2: 243–265.

Jayawickrama, N. A. 1948. "The Criteria for the Analysis of the Sutta Nipāta." *University of Ceylon Review* 6: 42–48.

———. 1951. "A Critical Analysis of the Pāli Sutta Nipāta Illustrating Its Gradual Growth: General Observations and Conclusions." *University of Ceylon Review* 9: 113–124.

Ji Xianlin 季羨林. 1947. "Foutu yu fo" 浮屠與佛 [The Transcriptions *Foutu* and *Fo*]. *Zhongyang yanjiuyuan lishi yuyan yanjiusuo jikan* 中央研究院歷史語言研究所集刊 [Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica] 20: 93–105. Translated as "On the Oldest Chinese Transliterations of the Name of Buddha," *Sino-Indian Studies* 3, pts. 1 and 2 (1947): 1–9.

———. 1990. "Zaitan foutu yu fo" 再談浮屠與佛 [Another Discussion of the Transcriptions *Foutu* and *Fo*]. *Lishi yanjiu* 歷史研究 [Historical Studies] 2: 3–11.

Johnson, Benton. 1963. "On Church and Sect." *American Sociological Review* 28.4: 539–549.

Johnston, E. H. 1936. *The Buddhacarita or Acts of the Buddha.* Lahore. Rpt. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1984.

Jones, J. J. 1949–1956. *The Mahāvastu.* 3 vols. Sacred Books of the Buddhists, vols. 16, 18, and 19. London: Luzac and Company, Ltd.

Kajiyama Yuichi. 1977. "Thus Spoke the Blessed One. . . ." In Lancaster 1977, 93–99.

Kamala Tiyavanich. 1997. *Forest Recollections: Wandering Monks in Twentieth-Century Thailand.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Kanda Kiichirō 神田喜一郎. 1962. "Chūgoku shodōshijō yori mitaru Ōtani tankentai no shōraihin ni tsuite" 中国書道史上より見たる大谷探検隊の将来品について [On Articles Brought from the Ōtani Expeditions Viewed from the Standpoint of the History of Chinese Calligraphy]. In *Saiiki bunka kenkyū* 西域文化研究 [Study of the Culture of the Western Regions], 241–253. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

Kapstein, Matthew T. 2001. *Reason's Traces: Identity and Interpretation in Indian and Tibetan Buddhist Thought.* Boston: Wisdom Publications.

Karashima Seishi 辛嶋静志. 1993. "Hokkekyō ni okeru jō (yāna) to chie (jñāna)—daijō bukkyō ni okeru yāna no gainen no kigen ni tsuite" 法華経における乗 (yāna) と智慧 (jñāna)—大乗仏教における yāna の概念の起源について [Vehicle *(yāna)* and Wisdom *(jñāna)* in the Lotus Sūtra—On the Origin of the Concept of *Yāna* in Mahāyāna Buddhism]. In *Hokkekyō no juyō to tenkai* 法華経の受容と展開 [The Acceptance and Development of the Lotus Sūtra], edited by Taga Ryūgen, 137–197. Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten.

———. 1996. "Kan'yaku butten no kango to onshago no mondai" 漢訳仏典の漢語と音写語の問題 [Problems in the Language and Transcriptions of the Chinese Buddhist Translations]. In *Higashi Ajia shakai to bukkyō bunka* 東アジア社会と仏教文化 [East Asian Society and Buddhist Culture], edited by Takasaki Jikidō and Kimura Shōkō, 202–218. Tokyo: Shunshūkai.

———. 1998. *A Glossary of Dharmarakṣa's Translation of the Lotus Sutra* 正法華經詞典. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica I. Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.

———. 2001. "Who Composed the Lotus Sutra? Antagonism between Wilderness and Village Monks." *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2000,* 4: 143–179.

Keenan, John P. 1994. *How Master Mou Removes Our Doubts: A Reader-Response Study and Translation of the Mou-tzu Li-huo lun.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Kemper, Steven. 1990. "Wealth and Reformation in Sinhalese Buddhist Monasticism." In *Ethics, Wealth, and Salvation: A Study in Buddhist Social Ethics,* edited by Russell F. Sizemore and Donald K. Swearer, 152–169. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

Kent, Stephen A. 1982. "A Sectarian Interpretation of the Rise of the Mahayana." *Religion* 12: 311–332.

Kern, Hendrik, ed. 1891. *The Jātaka-Mālā or Bodhisattvāvadāna-Mālā by Ārya-Śūra.* Harvard Oriental Series 1. Boston: Ginn and Company.

Kern, Hendrik, and Bunyiu Nanjio, eds. 1908–1912. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka.* Bibliotheca Buddhica X. St. Petersburg: Imperial Academy. Rpt. Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1970.

Khoroche, Peter. 1987. *Towards a New Critical Edition of Ārya-Śūra's Jātakamālā.* Indica et Tibetica 12. Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.

———. 1989. *Once the Buddha Was a Monkey: Ārya Śūra's Jātakamālā.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kieffer-Pülz, Petra, and Jens-Uwe Hartmann, eds. 1997. *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday.* Swisttal-Oldendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.

Kieschnick, John. 1997. *The Eminent Monk: Buddhist Ideals in Medieval Chinese Hagiography.* Kuroda Institute Studies in East Asian Buddhism 10. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Klaus, Konrad. 1997. "Einige textkritische und exegetische Bemerkungen zu Śāntidevas Śikṣāsamuccaya (Kapitel XII und XIII)." In Kieffer-Pülz and Hartmann 1997, 397–406.

Knox, Robert. 1992. *Amaravati: Buddhist Sculpture from the Great Stūpa.* London: British Museum Press.

Konow, Sten. 1929. *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions with the Exception of Those of Aśoka.* Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, vol. 2, pt. 1. Calcutta: Government of India. Rpt. Varanasi: Indological Book House, 1969.

Krishan, Y. 1966. "The Hair on the Buddha's Head and Uṣṇīṣa." *East and West* n.s. 16: 275–289.

Kuwayama Shōshin 桑山正進. 1987. "Literary Evidence for Dating the Colossi in Bāmiyān." In *Orientalia Iosephi Tucci Memoriae Dicata,* edited by G. Gnoli and L. Lanciotti, 703–727. Rome: Istituto Italiano Per Il Medio Ed Estremo Oriente.

———. 2006. "Pilgrimage Route Changes and the Decline of Gandhāra." In Brancaccio and Behrendt 2006, 107–134.

Lai, Whalen. 1983. "Before the Prajñā Schools: The Earliest Chinese Commentary on the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā.*" *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 6.1: 91–108.

Lamotte, Étienne. 1938. *La somme du Grand Véhicule d'Asaṅga (Mahāyānasaṃgraha),* 2 vols. Louvain: Université de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste. Rpt. Louvain-La-Neuve, 1973.

———. 1944–1980. *Le traité de la "Grande vertu de sagesse" de Nāgārjuna.* 5 vols. Louvain: Université de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste (vols. 1 and 2 rpt. Louvain-La-Neuve, 1981).

———. 1954. "Sur la formation du Mahāyāna." In *Asiatica: Festschrift Friedrich Weller,* edited by Johannes Schubert, 377–396. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz.

———. 1976. *The Teaching of Vimalakīrti (Vimalakīrtinirdeśa).* Translated by Sara Boin. Oxford: Pali Text Society. Rpt. 1994 (translation of *L'enseignement de Vimalakīrti.* Louvain, 1962).

———. 1988. *History of Indian Buddhism: From the Origins to the Śaka Era.* Translated by Sara Webb-Boin under the supervision of Jean Dantinne. Louvain-La-Neuve: Université de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste (translation of *Histoire du bouddhisme indien: Des origines à l'ère Śaka.* Louvain, 1958).

———. 1998. *Śūraṃgamasamādhisūtra: The Concentration of Heroic Progress.* Translated by Sara Boin-Webb. Surrey, U.K.: Curzon Press (translation of *La concentration de la marche héroïque.* Brussels, 1965).

Lancaster, Lewis R., ed. 1977. *Prajñāpāramitā and Related Systems: Studies in Honor of Edward Conze.* Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series 1. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lariviere, Richard W. 1996. "Never Marry a Woman with Hairy Ankles." In *Festschrift Dieter Schlingloff,* edited by Friedrich Wilhelm, 165–172. Reinbek: Verlag für Orientalistische Fachpublikationen.

Launius, Roger D., and Linda Thatcher. 1994. *Differing Visions: Dissenters in Mormon History.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

La Vallée Poussin, Louis de. 1903. Review of Finot 1901. *Le Muséon,* n.s. 4: 306–317.

———. 1923–1931. *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu.* 6 vols. Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques, vol. 16. Brussels: Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises. Rpt. 1980.

———. 1925. "Notes bouddhiques VI: Notes sur le chemin du Nirvāṇa §3; Les fidèles laïcs ou upāsakas." *Bulletins de la classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques* (Académie royale de Belgique), 5th series, 11: 15–34.

———. 1930. "Notes bouddhiques: Opinions sur les relations des deux véhicules au point de vue du vinaya." *Bulletins de la classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques,* 5th series, 16: 20–39.

———. 1936/1937. "Musīla et Nārada: Le chemin du nirvāṇa." *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* 5: 189–222.

Lefmann, Salomon, ed. 1902. *Lalitavistara: Leben und Lehre des Śākya-Buddha.* Vol. 1. Halle a S.: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.

Le Goff, Jacques. 1988. *The Medieval Imagination.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. (Translation of *L'imaginaire médiéval.* Paris: Gallimard, 1985).

Lenz, Timothy. 2003. *A New Version of the Gāndhārī Dharmapada and a Collection of Previous-Birth Stories: British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments 16 + 25.* With Contributions by Andrew Glass and Bhikshu Dharmamitra. Gandhāran Buddhist Texts 3. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Lévi, Sylvain. 1915. "Sur la récitation primitive des textes bouddhiques." *Journal asiatique,* 11th series, 5: 401–446.

Lewis, Todd T. 2000. *Popular Buddhist Texts from Nepal: Narratives and Rituals of Newar Buddhism.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Li Rongxi. 1996. *The Great Tang Dynasty Record of the Western Regions.* Translated by the Tripiṭaka-Master Xuanzang under Imperial Order. BDK English Tripiṭaka 79. Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research.

———. 2002. *Lives of Great Monks and Nuns.* BDK English Tripiṭaka 76-III, IV, V, VI, VII. Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research.

Lienhard, Siegfried. 1978. "La légende du Prince Visvantara dans la tradition népalaise." *Arts asiatiques* 34: 139–156.

Lin Meicun 林梅村. 1998. *Han Tang xiyu yu zhongguo wenming* 漢唐西域與中國文明 [The Western Regions from the Han through Tang and Chinese Civilization]. Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe.

———. 2003. "Niya iseki shutsudo no karōshutei mon: 'Onshitsu senyoku shusō kyō'

zankan no kōsatsu (1)" 二ヤ遺跡出土のカローシュテイー文「温室洗浴衆僧経」残巻の考察（一）[A *Kharoṣṭhī* Text Excavated from the Ruins at Niya: An Examination of the Extant Part of the *Wenshi xiyu zhongseng jing*]. *Bukkyō daigaku: Bungakubu ronshū* 佛教大学「文学部論集」[Collected Essays of the Literature Section of Bukkyō University] 87: 137-152.

Link, Arthur E. 1960. "Shih Seng-yu and His Writings." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 80: 17–43.

Lopez, Donald S., Jr. 2005a. "Buddha." In Lopez 2005b, 13–36.

———. ed. 2005b. *Critical Terms for the Study of Buddhism.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lüders, Heinrich. 1941. *Bhārhut und die Buddhistische Literatur.* Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft.

MacQueen, Graeme. 1981. "Inspired Speech in Early Mahāyāna Buddhism I." *Religion* 11: 303–319.

———. 1982. "Inspired Speech in Early Mahāyāna Buddhism II." *Religion* 12: 49–65.

Malalasekere, G. P. 1937. *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names.* 2 vols. London: The Pali Text Society. Rpt. 1974.

Marshall, Sir John. 1960. *The Buddhist Art of Gandhāra: The Story of the Early School; Its Birth, Growth and Decline.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marshall, Sir John, Alfred Foucher, and N. G. Majumdar. 1940. *The Monuments of Sanchi.* 3 vols. Delhi: Archeological Survey of India.

Masefield, Peter. 1986. *Divine Revelation in Pali Buddhism.* Colombo: Sri Lanka Institute of Traditional Studies.

Matsunami Seiren 松涛誠廉, ed. 1975. "Bonbun Gattō Zanmai kyō" 梵文月燈三昧経 [The Sanskrit Text of the *Candrapradīpa-sūtra*]. *Taishō daigaku kenkyū kiyō* 大正大学研究紀要 [Journal of Taisho University] 60: (244)–(188); (2) 61: (796)–(761).

Matsunami Yoshihiro 松涛誠達 et al., eds. 2004. *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa and Jñānālokālaṃkāra: Transliterated Sanskrit Text Collated with Tibetan and Chinese Translations (Parts I-III).* Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature. The Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism, Taishō University. Tokyo: Taishō University Press.

Matsuo Yoshiki 松尾良樹. 1988. "Kandai yakkyō to kōgo—yakkyō ni yoru kōgoshi shotan" 漢代訳経と口語一訳経による口語史初探 [The Han Period Translated Scriptures and the Vernacular Language—the History of the Vernacular Language Based on the Translated Scriptures—a Preliminary Sketch]. *Zen bunka kenkyūsho kiyō* 禅文化研究所紀要 [The Bulletin of the Institute of Zen Studies] 15: 25–57.

McGill, Forrest. 1997. "Painting the 'Great Life.'" In Schober 1997, 195–217.

Meisig, Marion. 1995. *König Śibi und die Taube: Wandlung und Wanderung eines Erzählstoffes von Indien nach China.* Studies in Oriental Religions, vol. 35. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Miller, Barbara Stoler. 1979. "On Cultivating the Immeasurable Change of Heart: The Buddhist Brahma-Vihāra Formula." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 7: 209–221.

Mitsuhara Hōshū 蜜波羅鳳州. 1996. "Biku no kōsō: 'Sanmaiōkyō' o chūshin to shite"

比丘の抗争–「三昧王経」を中心として [Antagonism among Bhikṣus—Focusing on the *Samādhirājasūtra*]. *Nihon bukkyō gakkai nenpō* 日本仏教学会年報 [Journal of the Japanese Buddhist Research Association] 61: 75–89.

———. 2004. *Bonzō kanwa taishō Hōjukyō (Ratnarāśi-sūtra)* 梵蔵漢和対照宝聚経 (Ratnarāśi-sūtra) [A Contrastive Study of the Sanskrit, Tibetan, Chinese, and Japanese Versions of the Ratnarāśi-sūtra]. Tokyo: Sankibo-Busshorin Publishing Co., Ltd.

Mochizuki Kaie 望月海慧. 1999. "The Sūtras Cited in the Mahāsūtrasamuccaya of Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna." Paper presented at the twelfth conference of the International Association of Buddhist Studies, Lausanne, Switzerland, August 24–28.

Monier-Williams, Sir Monier. 1899. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press. Rpt. Tokyo: Meicho Fukyukai Co., 1986.

Mori Sodō 森祖道. 1989. "Ariyavansa to ariyavansa-kata—attakatā no gensen shiryō" アリヤヴァンサとアリヤヴァンサカターアッタカターの源泉資料 [Ariyavaṃsa and Ariyavaṃsakathā: The Original Materials of the *Aṭṭhakathā* Literature]. In *Indo tetsugaku to bukkyō: Fujita Kōtatsu hakushi kanreki kinen ronshū* インド哲学と仏教一藤田宏達博士還暦記念論集 [Indian Philosophy and Buddhism: Essays in Honor of Professor Kōtatsu Fujita on His Sixtieth Birthday], 225–244. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten.

———. 1993. "*Ariyavaṃsa* and *Ariyavaṃsakathā.*" In *Studies on Buddhism in Honour of Professor A. K. Warder,* edited by N. K. Wagle and F. Watanabe, 100–112 (translation of Mori 1989). Toronto: University of Toronto Centre for South Asian Studies.

Mukherjee, Biswadeb. 1966. *Die Überlieferung von Devadatta, dem Widersacher des Buddha, in den Kanonischen Schriften.* Munich: J. Kitzinger.

Mukhopadhyaya, Sujitkumar. 1962. *The Aśokāvadāna: Sanskrit Text Compared with Chinese Versions.* New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi.

Müller, F. Max, and Bunyiu Nanjio, eds. 1883. *Sukhāvatī-Vyūha: Description of Sukhāvatī; The Land of Bliss.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Murakami Shinkan 村上真完. 1969. "Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā no seiritsu ni tsuite" Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā の成立について [On the Formation of the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā*]. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* インド学仏教学研究 [Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies] 17.2: 195–198.

Myer, Prudence R. 1986. "Bodhisattvas and Buddhas: Early Buddhist Images From Mathurā." *Artibus Asiae* 47: 107–142.

Nagar, Shanti Lal. 1993. *Jātakas in Indian Art.* Delhi: Parimal Publications.

Nakamura Hajime 中村元 1981. *Bukkyōgo daijiten* 仏教語大辞典 [A Large Dictionary of Buddhist Terminology]. Tokyo: Tokyo Shoseki. Rpt. 1991.

Ñāṇamoli, Bhikkhu. 1975. *The Path of Purification (Visuddhimagga).* Kandy, Sri Lanka: Buddhist Publication Society. Rpt. Seattle: BPS Pariyatti Editions, 1999.

Nattier, Jan. 1990. "Church Language and Vernacular Language in Central Asian Buddhism." *Numen* 37.2: 195–219.

———. 1991. *Once Upon a Future Time: Studies in a Buddhist Prophecy of Decline.* Nanzan Studies in Asian Religions 1. Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press.

———. 2000. “The Realm of Akṣobhya: A Missing Piece in the History of Pure Land Buddhism.” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 23.1: 71–102.

———. 2003. *A Few Good Men: The Bodhisattva Path According to the ‘Inquiry of Ugra’ (Ugraparipṛcchā-sūtra).* Studies in the Buddhist Traditions. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.

Niebuhr, H. Richard. 1929. *The Social Sources of Denominationalism.* Rpt. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1965.

Nishimura Minori 西村実則. 1987. “Gandārago bukkyōken to kan’yaku butten” ガンダーラ語仏教圏と漢訳仏典 [Gāndhārī and the Chinese Translations of Buddhist Texts]. *Sankō bunka kenkyūjo nenpō* 三康文化研究所年報 [Annual Bulletin of the Sankō Research Institute] 20: 49–125.

Nobel, Johannes. 1937. *Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra: Das Goldglanz-Sūtra; Ein Sanskrittext des Mahāyāna-Buddhismus.* Leipzig: Otto Harrossowitz.

Nolot, Édith. 1995. *Entretiens de Milinda et Nāgasena.* Paris: Gallimard.

Norman, K. R. 1983. *Pāli Literature: Including the Canonical Literature in Prakrit and Sanskrit of All the Hīnayāna Schools of Buddhism.* A History of Indian Literature, vol. 7, fasc. 2. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

———. 1990a. “Pāli Philology and the Study of Buddhism.” In *The Buddhist Forum,* vol. 1, edited by Tadeusz Skorupski, 31–39. London: University of London (SOAS).

———. 1990b. “Why Are the Four Noble Truths Called ‘Noble’?” In *Ānanda: Papers on Buddhism and Indology, A Felicitation Volume Presented to Ananda Weihena Palliya Guruge on his Sixtieth Birthday,* edited by Y. Karunadasa, 11–13. Colombo: Vision House.

———. 1991. “Theravāda Buddhism and Brahmanical Hinduism: Brahmanical Terms in a Buddhist Guise.” In *The Buddhist Forum,* vol. 2, edited by Tadeusz Skorupski, 193–200. London: University of London (SOAS).

———. 1993. “The Languages of Early Buddhism.” In *Premier colloque Étienne Lamotte (Bruxelles et Liège 24–27 septembre 1989),* 83–99. Louvain-La-Neuve: Université de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste.

———. 1997. *The Word of the Doctrine (Dhammapada).* Oxford: Pali Text Society. Rpt. with corrections, 2000.

———. 2001. *The Group of Discourses (Sutta-Nipāta).* 2nd edition. Oxford: Pali Text Society.

O’Flaherty, Wendy Doniger, ed. 1980. *Karma and Rebirth in Classical Indian Traditions.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ohnuma, Reiko. 1992. “The Legend of King Sarvaṃdada.” M.A. thesis, University of Michigan.

———. 1997. “Dehadāna: The ‘Gift of the Body’ in Indian Buddhist Narrative Literature.” Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan.

———. 1998. “The Gift of the Body and the Gift of Dharma.” *History of Religions* 37.4: 323–359.

———. 2000a. “Internal and External Opposition to the Bodhisattva’s Gift of His Body.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 28: 43–75.

———. 2000b. “The Story of Rūpāvatī: A Female Past Birth of the Buddha.” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 23.1: 103–145.
———. 2001. “Woman, Bodhisattva, and Buddha.” *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 17.1: 63–83.
———. 2005. “Gift.” In Lopez 2005b, 103–123.
———. 2007. *Head, Eyes, Flesh, and Blood: Giving Away the Body in Indian Buddhist Literature.* New York: Columbia University Press.
Okabe Kazuo 岡部和雄. 1983. “Yakkyō to shakyō” 訳経と写経 [Translated Scriptures and Copied Sūtras]. *Tōyō gakujutsu kenkyū* 東洋学術研究 [Journal of Oriental Studies] 22.2: 13–47.
Okada Mamiko 岡田真美子. 1991. “Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā chū no shakuson zense 50 wa” Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā 中の釈尊前世５０話 [The Fifty Stories of the Former Lives of the Buddha in the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā*]. In *“Ga” no shisō—Mayeda Sengaku hakushi kanreki kinen ronshū* ＜我＞の思想–前田専学博士還暦記念論集 [The Idea of the Self: A Festschrift for Dr. Mayeda Sengaku], 581–596. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
———. 1993. “Yakushi shashin setsuwa (3) yakuyō ninnikushoku no mondai—Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā zenshōwa dai 29 no heikōwa” 薬施捨身説話 (3) 薬用人肉食の問題[Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā 前生話第 29 の並行話 [The Story of Sacrificing the Body (3) Problems Related to Remedial Cannibalism—with Parallels to Jātaka 29 of the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā*]. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* インド学仏教学研究 [Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies] 42.1: [40]–[44].
Okada Yukihiro 岡田行弘. 1989. “Sanjūni taijinsō no keitō (I)” 三十二大人相系統(I) [Sources for the Thirty-two Marks of the Superhuman]. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* インド学仏教学研究 [Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies] 38.1: 303–307.
———. 1990. “‘Daihōshakkyō’ ni okeru sanjūni taijinsō” 『大宝積経』における三十二大人相 [The Thirty-two Marks of a Superhuman in the *Mahāratnakūṭasūtra*]. *Kōbe nyoshi daigaku seto tanki daigaku gakujutsu kiyō* 神戸女子大学瀬戸短期大学学術紀要 [Bulletin of Arts and Sciences for the Kobe Women’s Junior College] 1: 43–50.
———. 1991a. “Hachijū shukō” 八十種好 [The Eighty Minor Signs]. In *“Ga” no shisō—Mayeda Sengaku hakushi kanreki kinen ronshū* ＜我＞の思想—前田専学博士還暦記念論集 [The Idea of the Self: A Festschrift for Dr. Mayeda Sengaku], 611–627. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
———. 1991b. “Sanjūni taijinsō no keitō (II)” 三十二大人相系統(II) [Sources for the Thirty-two Marks of the Superhuman]. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* インド学仏教学研究 [Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies] 40.1: 12–16.
———. 1996a. “Hannya kyōten ni okeru sanjūni taijinsō” 般若経典における三十二大人相 [The Thirty-two Marks of a Superhuman in the Perfection of Wisdom Scriptures]. In *Imanishi Junkichi kyōju kanreki kinen ronshū* 今西順吉教授還暦記念論集 [Essays in Commemoration of the Sixty-first Birthday of Prof. Imanishi Junkichi]. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
———. 1996b. “Sanjūni taijinsō no seiritsu” 三十二大人相成立 [The Formation of the Thirty-two Marks of the Superhuman]. In *Suguro Shinjō hakushi koki kinen*

ronbunshū 勝呂信静博士古稀記念論文集 [A Collection of Essays Commemorating the Seventieth Birthday of Dr. Suguro Shinjō]. Tokyo: Senchi Kōhei.

Okamoto Yoshiyuki 岡本嘉之. 1974. "Gokoku shomonkyō (Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā) no han'yaku sanbon tsuite" 護国所問経(Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā)の漢訳三本ついて [On the Three Chinese Translations of the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā-sūtra*]. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* インド学仏教学研究 [Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies] 23.1: 154–155.

———. 1979. "Gokoku shomonkyō yakuchū (1)" 護国所問経訳注(一) [Notes on the Translation of the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā-sūtra* (1)]. *Tōyōgaku kenkyū* 東洋学研究 [Journal of Oriental Studies] 14: 69–77.

———. 1985. "Bongo butten bōtō no kan'yōku 'evaṃ mayā śrutam ekasmin samaye' to sono kan'yaku oyobi chibettogo yakubun ni tsuite" 梵語仏典の冒頭の慣用句 'evaṃ mayā śrutam ekasmin samaye' とその漢訳およびチベット語訳文について [On the Standard Opening Line of Sanskrit Buddhist Texts *"evaṃ mayā śrutam ekasmin samaye"* and Its Chinese and Tibetan Translations]. *Tōyōgaku kenkyū* 東洋学研究 [Journal of Oriental Studies] 20: 21–28.

———. 1997. "Butten bōtō no kan'yōku saikō" 仏典冒頭の慣用句再考 [A Reconsideration of the Conventional Phrase at the Opening of Buddhist Texts]. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* インド学仏教学研究 [Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies] 46.1: 164–171.

Oldenberg, Hermann, and Richard Pischel, eds. 1883. *The Thera- and Therī-gāthā.* London: The Pali Text Society. 2nd ed. with appendices by K. R. Norman and Ludwig Alsdorf, 1966.

Olivelle, Patrick. 1991. "From Feast to Fast: Food and the Indian Ascetic." In *Rules and Remedies in Classical Indian Law,* edited by Julia Leslie, 17–36. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

———. 1992. *Saṃnyāsa Upaniṣads: Hindu Scriptures on Asceticism and Renunciation.* New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 1995. *Rules and Regulations of Brahmanical Asceticism:* Yatidharmasamuccaya *of Yādava Prakāśa.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

———. 2005. *Manu's Code of Law: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Mānava-Dharmaśāstra.* With the Editorial Assistance of Suman Olivelle. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Oshika Jisshū 大鹿実秋. 1970. "Chibetto-bun Yuimagyō tekisuto" チベット文維摩経テキスト[The Tibetan Text of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*]. *Indo koten kenkyū* インド古典研究 1: 137–240.

Pagel, Ulrich. 1995. *The Bodhisattvapiṭaka: Its Doctrines, Practices and Their Position in Mahāyāna Literature.* Buddhica Britannica. Series Continua 5. Tring, U.K.: Institute of Buddhist Studies.

Palumbo, Antonello. 2003. "Dharmarakṣa and Kaṇṭhaka: White Horse Monasteries in Early Medieval China." In *Buddhist Asia 1: Papers from the First Conference of Buddhist Studies Held in Naples in May 2001,* edited by Giovanni Verardi and Silvio Vita, 167–216. Kyoto: Italian School of East Asian Studies.

Parlier, Edith. 1991. "La légende du roi des Śibi: Du sacrifice brahmanique au don du corps bouddhique." *Bulletin d'études indiennes* 9: 133–160.

Pelliot, Paul. 1920. "'Meou-tseu ou les doutes levés,' traduit et annoté." *T'oung Pao* 19: 255–433.

Pischel, Richard. 1955. *A Grammar of the Prākrit Languages.* Translated by Subhadra Jhā. Rpt. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1981.

Pradhan, Prahlad, ed. 1975. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu.* 2nd ed. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series, vol. 8. Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute.

Pulleyblank, Edwin G. 1983. "Stages in the Transcription of Indian Words in Chinese from Han to Tang." In Röhrborn and Veenker 1983, 73–102.

Rahula, Walpola. 1943. "The Significance of 'Ariyavaṃsa.'" *University of Ceylon Review* 1.1: 59–68.

———. 1956. *History of Buddhism in Ceylon: The Anurādhapura Period. 3rd Century BC–10th Century AC.* Colombo: M. D. Gunasena and Co.

Rapson, E. J., and P. S. Noble, eds. 1929. *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions Discovered by Sir Aurel Stein in Chinese Turkestan.* Pt. 3. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Rasmussen, William Brian. 1995. "An Annotated Transcription and Translation of the Gilgit Manuscript of the *Ajitasenavyākaraṇanirdeśa-mahāyānasūtra.*" M.A. thesis, University of Texas at Austin.

Ray, Reginald. 1994. *Buddhist Saints in India: A Study in Buddhist Values and Orientations.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Régamey, Constantin. 1973. "Encore à propos du Lalitavistara et de l'épisode d'Asita." *Asiatische Studien/Études asiatiques* 28.1: 1–33.

Renou, Louis. 1961. *Grammaire sanscrite: Phonétique, composition, dérivation, le nom, le verbe, la phrase.* 2nd ed. 2 vols in 1. Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve. Rpt. 1984.

Renou, Louis, and Jean Filliozat. 1953. *L'Inde classique: Manuel des études indiennes.* 2 vols. Vol. 2 with the assistance of Paul Demiéville, Oliver Lacombe, and Pierre Meile. Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient. Rpt. 1996.

Reynolds, Frank E. 1997. "Rebirth Traditions and the Lineages of Gotama: A Study in Theravāda Buddhology." In Schober 1997, 19–39.

Rhi, Juhyung. 2006. "Bodhisattvas in Gandhāran Art: An Aspect of Mahāyāna in Gandhāran Buddhism." In Brancaccio and Behrendt 2006, 151–182.

Robinson, Richard H. 1965/1966. "The Ethic of the Householder Bodhisattva." *Bhāratī: Bulletin of the College of Indology* 9.2: 25–56.

———. 1967. *Early Mādhyamaka in India and China.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Rocher, Ludo. 1980. "Karma and Rebirth in the Dharmaśāstras." In O'Flaherty 1980, 61–89.

Röhrborn, Klaus, and Wolfgang Veenker, eds. 1983. *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien.* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Ruegg, David Seyfort. 1969. *La théorie du tathāgatagarbha et du gotra: Études sur la sotériologie et la gnoséologie du Bouddhisme.* Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient.

———. 1974. "Pāli *Gotta/Gotra* and the Term *Gotrabhū* in Pāli and Buddhist Sanskrit." In *Buddhist Studies in Honour of I. B. Horner,* edited by L. Cousins, A. Kunst, and K. R. Norman, 199–210. Dordrecht-Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Co.

———. 1981. "A Further Note on Pāli *Gotrabhū*." *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 9: 175–177.

———. 2005. "The Kalawān Copper-Plate Inscription: Early Evidence for Mahāyāna-Type Thinking?" *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 28.1: 3–9.

Sakaki Ryōsaburō 榊亮三郎. 1916. *Mahāvyutpatti: Bonzō kanwa shiyaku taikō. Hon'yaku meigi taishū* 梵蔵漢和四訳対校翻訳名義大集. Kyoto: Teikoku Daigaku Bunka Daigaku Sōsho. Rpt. Tokyo: Kokusho Kangyōkai, 1981.

Sakurabe Hajime 桜部建. 1974. "Gokoku sonja shomon kyō (Rāshutorapāra no toi)" 護国尊者所問経（ラーシュトラパーラの問い）[The Questions of *Rāṣṭrapāla*). In *Daijō butten* 大乗仏典 [Mahāyāna Scriptures] 9, *Hōsekibu kyōten* 宝積部経典 [The Ratnakūṭa Scriptures], 125–230. Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha.

———. 1991. "Papañca kō" Papañca 考 [An Examination of the Term "Papañca"]. *Pārigaku bukkyō bunkagaku* パーリ学仏教文化学 [Pāli Studies and Buddhist Cultural Studies] 4: 17–25.

Salomon, Richard. 1998a. *Indian Epigraphy: A Guide to the Study of Inscriptions in Sanskrit, Prakrit, and Other Indo-Aryan Languages.* New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 1998b. "Kharoṣṭhī Manuscript Fragments in the Pelliot Collection, Bibliothèque Nationale de France." *Bulletin d'études indiennes* 16: 123–160.

———. 1999. *Ancient Buddhist Scrolls from Gandhāra: The British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments.* Seattle: University of Washington Press.

———. 2000. *A Gāndhārī Version of the Rhinoceros Sūtra.* Gandhāran Buddhist Texts 1. With a Contribution by Andrew Glass. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

———. 2001. "'Gāndhārī Hybrid Sanskrit': New Sources for the Study of the Sanskritization of Buddhist Literature." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 44: 241–252.

———. 2002. "A Fragment of a Collection of Buddhist Legends, with a Reference to King Huviṣka as a Follower of the Mahāyāna." In *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection III: Buddhist Manuscripts,* edited by Jens Braarvig, vol. 2, 255–267. Oslo: Hermes Publishing.

———. 2003. "The Senior Manuscripts: Another Collection of Gandhāran Buddhist Scrolls." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 123.1: 73–92.

———. 2006. "New Manuscript Sources for the Study of Gandhāran Buddhism." In Brancaccio and Behrendt 2006, 135–147.

Samtani, N. H. 1964–1965. "The Opening of the Buddhist Sūtras." *Bharati: Bulletin of the College of Indology* 8.2: 47–63.

Samuel, Geoffrey. 1993. *Civilized Shamans: Buddhism in Tibetan Societies.* Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Samuels, Jeffrey. 1999. "Views of Householders and Lay Disciples in the *Sutta Piṭaka:* A Reconsideration of the Lay/Monk Opposition." *Religion* 29: 231–241.

Sasaki, Shizuka 佐々木閑. 1995. "Daijō bukkyō zaike kigensetsu no mondaiten" 大乗仏教在家起源説の問題点 [Problems on the Theory of the Householder Origins of Mahāyāna Buddhism]. *Hanazono daigaku bungakubu kenkyū kiyō* 花園大学文学部研究紀要 [Bulletin of the Faculty of Letters, Hanazono University] 27: 29–62.

———. 1997. "A Study of the Origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism." *The Eastern Buddhist,* n.s. 30.1: 79–113 (translation of Sasaki 1995).

Schlingloff, Dieter. 1999. *Guide to the Ajanta Paintings,* vol. 1: *Narrative Wall Paintings.* Translated from German by Miriam Higgins. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.

———. 2000. *Erzählende Wandmalereien: Narrative Wall-Paintings.* 3 vols. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Schmithausen, Lambert. 1987. *Ālayavijñāna: On the Origin and Early Development of a Central Concept of Yogācāra Philosophy.* 2 parts. Studia Philologica Buddhica. Monograph Series 4a. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

Schober, Juliane, ed. 1997. *Sacred Biography in the Buddhist Traditions of South and Southeast Asia.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Schopen, Gregory. 1975. "The Phrase *'sa pṛthivīpradeśaś caityabhūto bhavet'* in the *Vajracchedikā:* Notes on the Cult of the Book in Mahāyāna." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 17: 147–181.

———. 1978. "The Bhaiṣajyaguru-Sūtra and the Buddhism of Gilgit." Ph.D. dissertation, Australian National University (Canberra).

———. 1979. "Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 21: 1–19.

———. 1985. "Two Problems in the History of Indian Buddhism: The Layman/Monk Distinction and the Doctrines of the Transference of Merit." *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 10: 9–47.

———. 1987a. "Burial 'Ad Sanctos' and the Physical Presence of the Buddha in Early Indian Buddhism: A Study in the Archeology of Religions." *Religion* 17: 193–225.

———. 1987b. "The Inscription on the Kuṣān Image of Amitābha and the Character of the Early Mahāyāna in India." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 10.2: 99–134.

———. 1988/1989. "On Monks, Nuns and 'Vulgar' Practices: The Introduction of the Image Cult into Indian Buddhism." *Artibus Asiae* 49.1–2: 153–168.

———. 1989. "The Manuscript of the Vajracchedikā Found at Gilgit: An Annotated Transcription and Translation." In *Studies in the Literature of the Great Vehicle: Three Mahāyāna Buddhist Texts,* edited by Luis O. Gómez and Jonathan A. Silk, 89–139. Ann Arbor: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of Michigan.

———. 1991. "Archeology and Protestant Presuppositions in the Study of Indian Buddhism." *History of Religions* 31.1: 1–23.

———. 1992. "On Avoiding Ghosts and Social Censure: Monastic Funerals in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya.*" *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 20: 1–39.

———. 1994a. "Doing Business for the Lord: Lending on Interest and Written Loan Contracts in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya.*" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 114.4: 527–554.

———. 1994b. "The Monastic Ownership of Servants or Slaves: Local and Legal Factors in the Redactional History of Two *Vinayas.*" *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 17.2: 145–173.

———. 1994c. "Ritual Rights and Bones of Contention: More on the Monastic Funerals and Relics in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya*." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 22: 31–80.

———. 1995a. "Death, Funerals, and the Division of Property in a Monastic Code." In *Buddhism in Practice,* edited by Donald S. Lopez, Jr., 473–502. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

———. 1995b. "Monastic Law Meets the Real World: A Monk's Continuing Right to Inherit Family Property in Classical India." *History of Religions* 35.2: 101–123.

———. 1996. "The Lay Ownership of Monasteries and the Role of the Monk in Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasteries." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 19.1: 81–126.

———. 1999. "The Bones of a Buddha and the Business of a Monk: Conservative Monastic Values in an Early Mahāyāna Polemical Tract." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 27: 279–324.

———. 2000a. "The Good Monk and His Money in a Buddhist Monasticism of "The Mahāyāna Period." *Eastern Buddhist,* n.s. 32.1: 85–105.

———. 2000b. "The Mahāyāna and the Middle Period in Indian Buddhism: Through a Chinese Looking-Glass." *Eastern Buddhist,* n.s. 32.2: 1–25.

———. 2001. "Dead Monks and Bad Debts: Some Provisions of a Buddhist Monastic Inheritance Law." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 44: 99–148.

———. 2004. "Mahāyāna." In *Encyclopedia of Buddhism,* edited by Robert E. Buswell, Jr., 492–499. New York: Macmillan Reference USA.

———. 2005. "On Sending the Monks Back to Their Books: Cult and Conservatism in Early Mahāyāna Buddhism." In Gregory Schopen, *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India: More Collected Papers,* 108–153. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Schulte, Rainer, and John Biguenet. 1992. *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Schuster, Nancy. 1981. "Changing the Female Body: Wise Women and the Bodhisattva Career in Some *Mahāratnakūṭasūtras*." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 4.1: 24–69.

———. 1985. "The *Bodhisattva* Figure in the *Ugraparipṛcchā*." In *New Paths in Buddhist Research,* edited by Anthony K. Warder, 26–56. Durham, NC: The Acorn Press.

Seidel, Anna K. 1969. *La divinisation de Lao Tseu dans le Taoisme des Han.* Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient.

Sen, Tansen. 2002. "The Revival and Failure of Buddhist Translations during the Song Dynasty." *T'oung Pao* 88: 27–80.

———. 2003. *Buddhism, Diplomacy, and Trade: The Realignment of Sino-Indian Relations, 600–1400.* Association for Asian Studies/Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Senart, Émile. 1882. *Essai sur la légende du Buddha.* Paris: Ernest Leroux.

———. 1882–1897. *Le Mahāvastu.* 3 vols. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.

Shackleton Bailey, D. R. 1954. Review of Ensink 1952. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 79–82.

Sharf, Robert H. 1995. "Buddhist Modernism and the Rhetoric of Meditative Experience." *Numen* 42: 228–283.

———. 1996. "The Scripture in Forty-two Sections." In *Religions of China in Practice,* edited by Donald S. Lopez, Jr., 360–371. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

———. 2005. "Ritual." In Lopez 2005b, 245–270.

Shaw, Teresa M. 1998. *The Burden of the Flesh: Fasting and Sexuality in Early Christianity.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Shih, Robert. 1968. *Biographies des moines éminents (Kao Seng Tchouan) de Houei-Kiao.* Louvain: Université de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste.

Shipps, Jan. 1987. *Mormonism: The Story of a New Religious Tradition.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Shizutani Masao 静谷正雄. 1962. "Mahāyāna Inscriptions in the Gupta Period." *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* インド学仏教学研究 [Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies] 19: [358]–[355].

Siegel, Lee. 1987. *Laughing Matters: Comic Tradition in India.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Silber, Ilana Friedrich. 1995. *Virtuosity, Charisma, and Social Order: A Comparative Sociological Study of Monasticism in Theravada Buddhism and Medieval Catholicism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Silk, Jonathan A. 1989. "A Note on the Opening Formula of Buddhist Sūtras." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 12.1: 158–163.

———. 1992. "A Bibliography on Ancient Indian Slavery." *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* (St II) 16: 277–285.

———. 1994. "The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism with a Study of the Ratnarāśisūtra and Related Materials." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan.

———. 2002. "What, If Anything, is Mahāyāna Buddhism? Problems of Definitions and Classifications." *Numen* 49: 355–405.

———. 2003. "Dressed for Success: The Monk Kāśyapa and Strategies of Legitimation in Earlier Mahāyāna Buddhist Scriptures." *Journal asiatique* 291.1–2: 173–219.

Skilling, Peter. 1992. "Symbols on the Body, Feet, and Hands of a Buddha: Part I—Lists." *Journal of the Siam Society* 80.2: 67–79.

———. 1996. "Symbols on the Body, Feet, and Hands of a Buddha: Part II—Short Lists." *Journal of the Siam Society* 84.1: 5–28.

———. 2006. "*Jātaka* and *Paññāsa-jātaka* in South-East Asia." *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 28: 113–173.

Snell-Hornby, Mary. 1988. *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach.* Philadelphia: J. Benjamins Publishing Co.

Spiro, Melford E. 1970. *Buddhism and Society: A Great Tradition and Its Burmese Vicissitudes.* 2nd edition. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.

Sponberg, Alan. 1992. "Attitudes toward Women and the Feminine in Early Buddhism." In *Buddhism, Sexuality, and Gender,* edited by José Ignacio Cabezón, 3–36. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Stäel-Holstein, Baron Alexander Wilhelm von, ed. 1926. *The Kāçyapaparivarta: A Mahāyānasūtra of the Ratnakūṭa Class Edited in the Original Sanskrit in Tibetan and in Chinese.* Shanghai: Commercial Press. Rpt. Tokyo: Meicho-Fukyū-kai, 1977.

———, ed. 1933. *Commentary to the Kāśyapaparivarta.* Peking: National Library of Peking and National Tsinghua University.

Stark, Rodney. 1996. *The Rise of Christianity: A Sociologist Reconsiders History.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Stark, Rodney, and William Sims Bainbridge. 1979. "Of Churches, Sects, and Cults: Preliminary Concepts for a Theory of Religious Movements." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 18.2: 117–133. Rpt. in Stark and Bainbridge 1985, 19–37.

———. 1985. *The Future of Religion: Secularization, Revival and Cult Formation.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 1987. *A Theory of Religion.* New York: Peter Lang. Rpt. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1996.

Stark, Rodney, and Roger Finke. 2000. *Acts of Faith: Explaining the Human Side of Religion.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Stevenson, Daniel B. 1995. "Pure Land Buddhist Worship and Meditation in China." In *Buddhism in Practice,* edited by Donald S. Lopez, Jr., 359–379. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

———. 1996. "Visions of Mañjuśrī on Mount Wutai." In *Religions of China in Practice,* edited by Donald S. Lopez, Jr., 203–222. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Stone, Elizabeth Rosen. 1994. *The Buddhist Art of Nāgārjunakoṇḍa.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Strauch, Ingo 2007. "The Bajaur Collection: A New Collection of Kharoṣṭhī Manuscripts—A Preliminary Catalogue and Survey." Online version 1.0. Freie Universität Berlin, http://www.geschkolt.fu-berlin.de/e/indologie/bajaur/publication/index.html (accessed August 2007).

Strenski, Ivan. 1983. "On Generalized Exchange and the Domestication of the *Sangha.*" *Man,* n.s. 18: 463–477.

Strong, John S. 1983. *The Legend of King Aśoka: A Study and Translation of the "Aśokāvadāna."* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

———. 1993. "Buddha Bhakti and the Absence of the Blessed One." In *Premier colloque Étienne Lamotte (Bruxelles et Liège 24–27 septembre 1989),* 131–140. Louvain-La-Neuve: Université de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste.

———. 2001. *The Buddha: A Short Biography.* Oxford: One World.

———. 2002. *The Experience of Buddhism: Sources and Interpretations.* 2nd edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

———. 2004. *Relics of the Buddha.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Sugimoto Takushū 杉本卓州. 1968. "A Study in Jātaka-Scenes Depicted in the Gateways of Sāñcī Stūpa." *Journal of the Bihar Research Society* 54: 202–215.

———. 1986. "Honshō bosatsu no daijōka" 本生菩薩の大乗化 [The Mahāyāna Transformation of the Bodhisattva Figure in the Jātakas]. *Nihon bukkyō gakkai nenpō* 日本仏教学会年報 [Annual Bulletin of the Japanese Buddhist Research Society] 51: 15–27.

Suzuki Hiromi 鈴木裕美. 1995. "Koyaku kyōten ni okeru yakugo ni tsuite—Jiku hōgo yakushutsu kyōten o chūshin to shite" 古訳経典における訳語について—竺法護訳出経典を中心として [On the Translation Vocabulary in the Old Translations—Focusing on the Translation Corpus of Dharmarakṣa]. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* インド学仏教学研究 [Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies] 43. 2: 722–724.

Swearer, Donald K. 1995. *The Buddhist World of Southeast Asia.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡邊海旭, eds. 1924–1935. *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大蔵経 [The Complete Buddhist Canon Newly Edited during the Taishō Reign Period]. 100 vols. Tokyo: Daizōkyō Publication Committee.

Takasaki Jikidō 高崎直道. 1967. "Shōshu āryavaṃśa to shōshō gotra" 聖種 āryavaṃśa と聖姓 gotra [On Āryavaṃśa and Gotra]. *Nihon bukkyō gakkai nenpō* 日本仏教学会年報 [Annual Bulletin of the Japanese Buddhist Research Association] 32: 1–21.

———. 1992. "On *gotrabhū*." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 36 (Supplementband): 251–259.

Tambiah, Stanley Jeyaraja. 1984. *The Buddhist Saints of the Forest and the Cult of Amulets: A Study in Charisma, Hagiography, Sectarianism, and Millennial Buddhism.* Cambridge Studies in Social Anthropology 49. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tang Yongtong 湯用彤. 1938. *Han wei liangjin nanbeichao fojiaoshi* 漢魏兩晉南北朝佛教史 [A History of Buddhism during the Han and Six Dynasties Period]. 2 vols. Changsha: Shangwu yinshu guan. Rpt. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983.

Tatz, Mark. 1993. "Brief Communication." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 36: 335–336.

Teiser, Stephen. 1994. *The Scripture of the Ten Kings and the Making of Purgatory in Medieval Chinese Buddhism.* Kuroda Institute Studies in East Asian Buddhism. Honolulu: University of Hawaiʻi Press.

Thomas, Werner. 1989. *Probleme der Übertragung buddhistischer Texte ins Tocharische.* Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur. Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftllichen Klasse Jahrgang 1989, 10. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Toda Hirofumi 戸田宏文. 1981. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra: Central Asian Manuscripts; Romanized Text.* Tokushima: Kyoiku Shuppan Center.

Tokiwa Daijō 常盤大定. 1938. *Gokan yori sōsei ni itaru yakkyō sōroku* 後漢より宋斉に至る訳経総録 [Catalogues of Scriptural Translations from the Late Han to the Song-Qi Period]. Tokyo: Tōhō Bunka Gakuin. Rpt. Kokusho Kangyō, 1973.

Tola, Fernando, and Carmen Dragonetti. 1999. "Ekaṃ Samayam." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 42.1: 53–55.

Trenckner, Vilhelm, et al. 1924–. *A Critical Pāli Dictionary.* Copenhagen: Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters.

Tso Sze-bong 曹仕邦. 1963. "Lun zhongguo fojiao yichang zhi yijing fanshi yu chengxu" 論中國佛教譯場之譯經方式與程序 [Evaluating the Methods and Procedures for Translating *Sūtra*s at Buddhist Translation Centers in China]. *Xin ya xuebao* 新亞學報 [New Asia Journal] 5: 239–321.

Tsukamoto Zenryū. 1985. *A History of Early Chinese Buddhism: From Its Introduc-

tion to the Death of Hui-yüan. 2 vols. Translated by Leon Hurvitz. Tokyo: Kodansha International.

Vaganay, Léon, and Christian-Bernard Amphoux. 1991. *An Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism.* Translated by Jenny Heimerdinger. 2nd rev. ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

van Gulik, R. H. 1956. *Siddham: An Essay on the History of Sanskrit Studies in China and Japan.* Nagpur: International Academy of Indian Culture.

Vernant, Jean-Pierre. 1989. "Dim Body, Dazzling Body." Translated by Anne M. Wilson. In *Fragments for a History of the Human Body,* part 1, edited by Michel Feher, 19–47. New York: Zone.

Vetter, Tilmann. 1990. "Some Remarks on Older Portions of the Suttanipāta." In *Earliest Buddhism and Madhyamaka,* edited by D. S. Ruegg and L. Schmidthausen, 36–56. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

———. 1993. "Compounds in the Prologue of the Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens und Archiv für indische Philosophie* 37: 45–92.

———. 1994. "On the Origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism and the Subsequent Introduction of *Prajñāpāramitā." Asiatische Studien/Études asiatiques* 48.4: 1241–1281.

Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, M. I. 2002. *The Kāśyapaparivarta: Romanized Text and Facsimiles.* In Collaboration with Seishi Karashima and Noriyuki Kudo. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica 5. Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.

Waldschmidt, Ernst. 1932. *Bruchstücke buddhistischer Sūtras aus dem zentralasiatischen Sanskritkanon I.* Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft.

———. 1950/1951. *Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra: Text in Sanskrit und Tibetisch, Verglichen mit dem Pāli Nebst Einer Übersetzung der Chinesischen Entsprechung im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins.* Parts 1–3. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

———. 1956. *Das Mahāvadānasūtra: Ein Kanonischer Text über die Sieben Letzten Buddhas; Sanskrit, Verglichen mit dem Pāli Nebst Einer Analyse der in Chinesischer Übersetzung Überlieferten Parallelversionen,* part 2: *Die Textbearbeitung.* Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

———. 1980. "The Rāṣṭrapālasūtra in Sanskrit Remnants from Central Asia." In *Indianisme et Bouddhisme: Mélanges offerts à Mgr. Étienne Lamotte,* 359–374. Louvain-La-Neuve: Institut Orientaliste.

Waldschmidt, Ernst, et al. 1973–. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Waley, Arthur. 1957. "Review of Zenryū Tsukamoto, *Chōron kenkyū.*" *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 19.1: 195–196.

Walser, Joseph. 2005. *Nāgārjuna in Context: Mahāyāna Buddhism and Early Indian Culture.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Walters, Jonathan S. 1990. "The Buddha's Bad Karma: A Problem in the History of Theravāda Buddhism." *Numen* 37.1: 70–95.

———. 1997. "Stūpa, Story, and Empire: Constructions of the Buddha Biography in Early Post-Aśokan India." In Schober 1997, 160–192.

———. 2003. "Communal Karma and Karmic Community in Theravāda Buddhist History." In Holt et al. 2003, 9–39.

Wang Bangwei 王邦維. 1994. "Buddhist Nikāyas through Ancient Chinese Eyes." In *Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur.* Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 166–203.

———. 1995. *Nanhai jigui neifa zhuan jiaozhu* 南海寄歸內法傳校注 [Annotations to *The Record of Buddhism Sent Home from the Southern Seas*]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju. Rpt. 2000.

Wang, Yi-t'ung. 1981. *A Record of Buddhist Monasteries in Lo-yang by Yang Hsüan-chih.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Warder, A. K. 1970. *Indian Buddhism.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. Revised edition, 1980.

Warren, Henry Clarke, ed. 1950. *Visuddhimagga of Buddhaghosācariya.* Revised by Dharmananda Kosambi. Harvard Oriental Series. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Rpt. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1989.

Wayman, Alex. 1957. "Contributions Regarding the Thirty-Two Characteristics of the Great Person." *Sino-Indian Studies* 5.3–4: 243–260.

Wayman, Alex, and Hideko Wayman. 1974. *The Lion's Roar of Queen Śrīmālā: A Buddhist Scripture on the Tathāgatagarbha Theory.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Weber, Claudia. 2002. *Die Lichtmetaphorik im frühen Mahāyāna-Buddhismus.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Weber, Max. 1946. "The Social Psychology of the World Religions." In *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology,* translated, edited, and with an Introduction by H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, 267–301. New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 1958. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism.* Translated by Talcott Parsons. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Weiss, Mitchell G. 1980. "*Caraka Saṃhitā* on the Doctrine of Karma." In O'Flaherty 1980, 90–115.

Weller, Friedrich. 1973. "Der arme Heinrich in Indien." *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 68: 437–448.

Werner, Karel. 1981. "*Bodhi* and *Arahattaphala:* From Early Buddhism to Early Mahāyāna." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 4.1: 70–84.

Wijayaratna, Mohan. 1990. *Buddhist Monastic Life according to the Texts of the Theravāda Tradition.* Translated by Claude Grangier and Steven Collins. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wijesekera, O. H. de. 1979. "The Etymology of Pāli Gotrabhū." In *Pāli and Buddhist Studies: Memorial Volume in Honor of Bhikkhu Jagdish Kashyap,* 381–382. Delhi: B. R. Publishing Corporation.

Williams, Paul. 1989. *Mahāyāna Buddhism: The Doctrinal Foundations.* London/New York: Routledge.

———. 2000. *Buddhist Thought: A Complete Introduction to the Indian Tradition.* With Anthony Tribe. London/New York: Routledge.

Wilson, Bryan R., ed. 1967. *Patterns of Sectarianism: Organisation and Ideology in Social and Religious Movements.* London: Heinemann.

———. 1982. *Religion in Sociological Perspective.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, Liz. 1996. *Charming Cadavers: Horrific Figurations of the Feminine in Indian Buddhist Hagiographic Literature.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Winternitz, Maurice. 1983. *History of Indian Literature,* vol. 2: *Buddhist Literature and Jaina Literature.* Translated by V. Srinivasa Sarma. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. Translation of *Geschichte der Indische Literatur,* vol. 2. Stuttgart: K. F. Koehler Verlag, 1912–1920.

Witanachchi, C. 1966. "Ariyavaṃsa." In *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism,* vol. 2, fasc. 1, edited by G. P. Malalasekera, 89–92. Colombo: Government of Ceylon.

Wogihara, Unrai 荻原雲来. 1932. *Abhisamayālaṃkār'ālokā Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā: The Work of Haribhadra, Together with the Text Commented on.* Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko. Rpt. 1973.

Wolski, J. 1990. "Le titre de 'roi des rois' dans l'idéologie monarchique des Arsacides." In *From Alexander the Great to Kül Tegin: Studies in Bactrian, Pahlavi, Sanskrit, Arabic, Aramaic, Armenian, Chinese, Türk, Greek and Latin Sources for the History of Pre-Islamic Central Asia,* edited by János Harmatta, 11–18. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Yabuuchi Satoko 薮内聡子. 2000. "Shoki bukkyō ni okeru biku no seikatsu yōshiki—zudagyōsha no keifu" 初期仏教における比丘の生活様式—頭陀行者の系譜 [The Way of Life of Monks in Early Buddhism—the Lineage of the Dhutaguṇa Practitioners]. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* インド学仏教学研究 [Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies] 48.2: [71]–[73].

Yamada Isshi, ed. 1968. *Karuṇapuṇḍarīka.* 2 vols. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.

Yazdani, Ghulam. 1930. *Ajanta: The Colour and Monochrome Reproductions of the Ajanta Frescoes Based on Photography.* London: Oxford University Press.

Young, Lawrence A., ed. 1997. *Rational Choice Theory and Religion: Summary and Assessment.* London/New York: Routledge.

Zacchetti, Stefano. 1996. "Il *Chu Sanzang Ji Ji* di Sengyou Come Fonte per lo Studio delle Traduzioni Buddhiste Cinesi: Lo Sviluppo della Tecnica di Traduzione dal II al V Secolo D.C." *Annali di Ca' Foscari* 35.3: 347–374.

Zhu Qingzhi. 朱慶之 1992. *Fodian yu zhonggu hanyu cihui yanjiu* 佛典與中古漢語詞彙研究 [A Study of the Buddhist Canon and Medieval Chinese Vocabulary]. Taipei: Wenjin chubanshe.

Zürcher, Erik. 1959. *The Buddhist Conquest of China: The Spread and Adaptation of Buddhism in Early Medieval China.* 2 vols. Leiden: E. J. Brill. Rpt. 1972.

———. 1968. "The Yüeh-chih and Kaniṣka in the Chinese Sources." In *Papers on the Date of Kaniṣka,* edited by A. L. Basham, 346–390. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

———. 1977. "Late Han Vernacular Elements in the Earliest Buddhist Translations." *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association* 12.3: 177–203.

———. 1990. "Han Buddhism and the Western Regions." In *Thought and Law in Qin and*

Han China: Studies Dedicated to Anthony Hulsewé on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday, edited by W. L. Idema and E. Zürcher, 158–182. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

———. 1991. "A New Look at the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Texts." In *From Benares to Beijing: Essays on Buddhism and Chinese Religion in Honour of Prof. Jan Yün-hua,* edited by Koichi Shinohara and Gregory Schopen, 277–304. Oakville, Ontario: Mosaic Press.

———. 1995. "Aliens and Respected Guests: The Role of Foreign Monks in Early Chinese Buddhism." *Transactions of the International Conference of Eastern Studies* 40: 67–92.

Index

About the Author

Daniel Boucher, who received his doctorate from the University of Pennsylvania, is currently an associate professor of Sino-Indian Buddhism in the Department of Asian Studies at Cornell University. His work focuses on the earlier phases of the cluster of traditions typically referred to as the Mahāyāna, which emerged in India around the turn of the Common Era. He is also interested in the transmission of this movement to China in the first few centuries C.E., particularly with regard to the use of the early Chinese translations for charting changes in the tradition over time. Several of his previous publications have drawn attention to the importance of Gandhāra and the Gāndhārī language in this transmission process.